

not less than two-thirds of the Supreme Court for the purpose of deciding whether an act of Congress or an act of a State legislature is unconstitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

356. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the uniform fire and police reporting telephone numbers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 18160. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pileggi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 18161. A bill for the relief of Francisco Becerra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 18162. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis (Pete) K. Vlahos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 18163. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Bartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18164. A bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the L. R. Daniel Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 18165. A bill for the relief of Calogero Caruso and Salvatore Caruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18166. A bill for the relief of Mahir Sumar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 18167. A bill for the relief of Francesco Alfano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 18168. A bill for the relief of Manohar Ramaro Kamat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 18169. A bill for the relief of Victor Amaro Cuco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 18170. A bill for the relief of Dr. Segundo Sanchez, his wife, Graciela Sanchez, and four children, Segundo Humberto Sanchez, Oscar Sanchez, Fernando Sanchez, and Orlando Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 18171. A bill for the relief of Carlo Bragato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 18172. A bill for the relief of Dr. Imelda Salanlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 18173. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pilar Sartiaguda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 18174. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacques Charbonniez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18175. A bill for the relief of Anna Veltri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 18176. A bill for the relief of Hortensia Rivas and her minor children, Margarita, Terarito, Mercedes, Oscar, and Juan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 18177. A bill for the relief of Pavlos Kallianiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 18178. A bill for the relief of Placido Viterbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 18179. A bill for the relief of Albert R. Kaufmann and Richard O. Billings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18180. A bill for the relief of Zoila

Candida Lozoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18181. A bill for the relief of Juana J. Ovendo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18182. A bill for the relief of Gerardo B. Rojas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 18183. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Arnulfo P. Abilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18184. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Haruo Hayama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 18185. A bill for the relief of Mr. Angelo DiStefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18186. A bill for the relief of Mr. Francesco Rando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 18187. A bill for the relief of Ellsha Yehuda Babayoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

353. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., Department of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., relative to the use of democratic processes to achieve certain changes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

354. Also, petition of the president, Connecticut Probation and Parole Association, relative to supporting enactment of stringent gun control laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

355. Also, petition of Rabbi Martin Kohn, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

356. Also, petition of the board of supervisors, county of Tehama, Calif., relative to Federal welfare assistance to nonresidents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 18101—TO AMEND THE
INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I have today, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE], introduced H.R. 18101.

This proposed bill would correct an unintended hardship in section 337 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Section 337 provides that a corporation is not taxable on gain or loss realized upon sale of property if the corporation liquidates completely pursuant to a plan within 12 months so that its stockholders recognize gain on the liquidation of their stock in the corporation. The purpose of section 337 is to equate the tax situations of stockholders of a corporation which sells assets and liquidates and stockholders who sell their stock directly, by providing for a single tax at the stockholder level in each case. The benefits of section 337 are not available to a collapsible corporation as defined in section 341(b).

The section 341(b) definition of a collapsible corporation excludes a corporation which has held its purchased real

estate for more than 3 years. Hence, a real estate corporation which has purchased its real estate would benefit from section 337. The 3-year holding period relief for purchased real estate in section 341(b) does not, however, apply to real estate improvements which the corporation constructed itself. If, however, the stockholders of a corporation which has constructed real estate improvements sell their stock more than 3 years after the completion of construction, the adverse collapsible corporation treatment would not apply under section 341(a) even if literally the corporation is collapsible under 341(b). This is because section 341(d)(3) eliminates such treatment where the stockholders realize gain more than 3 years after the completion of construction. The result is the same as if the corporation were not collapsible under the section 341(b) definition, but the draft of the statute accomplished the result outside of the section defining a collapsible corporation.

Thus, if the stockholders of a corporation owning constructed real estate which has been completed more than 3 years prior to sale, sell their shares, a single tax will apply at capital gains rates at the stockholder level because of the section 341(d)(3) exception. If, however, the corporation sells its assets and

liquidates, section 337 will not apply because the relief obtained by a 3-year holding period following construction is not contained in the section 341(b) definition. In such a case there will be taxation at both the corporate and shareholder levels, contrary to the purpose of section 337 to equate sales of stock and sales of assets. On the other hand, if the corporation owns purchased real estate, there is only a single capital gains tax at the shareholder level, regardless of whether stock is sold or the corporation sells assets and then liquidates.

To correct this inequity the bill would amend section 337 to provide that section 337 benefits will apply even though a corporation is literally within the definition of a collapsible corporation under section 341(b), if the shareholders would not suffer collapsible corporation treatment by sale of their stock because of the 3-year period in section 341(d)(3). Section 333 presently sets a precedent for treating corporations with constructed real estate identically to those owning purchased real estate by language similar to that contained in proposed bill making special relief provisions of section 333 available where the corporation is not subject to the collapsible corporation rules under either the definition in section 341(b) or the relief provision of section

tion 341(d)(3). See Rev. Rul. 63-114, 1963-1 C.B. 74. The benefits of both section 333 and section 337 should be available where the 3-year period has elapsed, whether the real estate is purchased or constructed. The bill makes the benefits of section 337 available only in cases where the rules as to collapsibility would not apply to a sale of stock.

I commend this bill to you for your favorable consideration.

THE 10TH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 14-20, 1968

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, next month, during the week of July 14 to July 20, Americans across the Nation will be observing Captive Nations Week. This will be the 10th observance since Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution—Public Law 86-90—in 1959. Under the chairmanship of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the National Captive Nations Committee is making extensive preparations for the most successful observance yet. Even in foreign countries—the Republic of China, South Korea, Japan, South Vietnam, the Philippines, Argentina, West Germany, and others—similar preparations are being made.

The themes for this 10th observance will be many and one of the most important, in this International Human Rights Year, will be demands for human rights in the Soviet empire. The following material shows why this is of such importance:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.

New York, N.Y., February 26, 1968.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, representing over 2 million American citizens of Ukrainian descent and background, I would like to bring to the attention of the U.S. Government and yourself the recent wave of persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals by the Soviet government in Ukraine.

In 1968 the civilized world is observing the International Human Rights Year, during which every responsible government will take stock of the status of human rights within its own domain of responsibility and will help to promote the human rights in those areas and countries in which they are violated or non-existent.

Since 1965 the Soviet government has been engaged in wholesale arrest and trials of Ukrainian writers, poets, journalists, professors, students and other men and women of intellect, long before the arrest and trial of Andrei D. Sinyavsky and Yuli M. Daniel. And although the Ukrainian press in the free world, including the United States, has been replete with information on the persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals, only in 1966 did the international press break its silence by reporting the arrest and trial of two Ukrainian poets, Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dzuba. Undoubtedly, the Soviet government had successfully suppressed information with respect to Ukraine's intellectual opposition to the totalitarian communist rule.

However, a few weeks ago The Toronto Telegram, The New Leader (January 15, 1968), and subsequently The Times of London (February 7, 1968), The New York Times (February 8, 9 and 10, 1968) and The Observer of London (February 11, 1968), in a series of reports based on the manuscript of Vyacheslav Chornovil, a Ukrainian journalist now in a Soviet jail, revealed the entire gamut of Soviet Russian cultural oppression in Ukraine.

Briefly, the cultural oppression in Ukraine, in the last few years, could be summarized as follows:

1. Beginning in August 1965, a wave of arrests swept through Ukraine, involving over 200 Ukrainian intellectuals, arrested in such cities as Kiev, Lviv, Odessa, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lutsk, Zhytomyr and Ternopil—a veritable pogrom, which in scope and intensity surpassed the arrest and trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel.

2. Most of the arrested were young men and women, all of them reared under the Soviet system, and with no connection with Ukrainians in the free world.

3. They were charged with "anti-Soviet" nationalist writings, glorification of the Ukrainian past, propagation of pre-revolutionary books by Ukrainian authors who are now banned in Ukraine, and with circulating secretly speeches of Western leaders, as for instance, an encyclical of Pope John XXIII, and the address of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which he delivered at the unveiling of the Shevchenko monument on June 27, 1964 in Washington, D.C.

4. The arrests and trials of Ukrainian intellectuals were prepared and implemented by the KGB (Soviet secret police) in open defiance of the judicial and constitutional systems of the Ukrainian SSR, which expressly guarantee the inviolability of a person and his rights. All of them were tried under Article 62 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR, dealing with "anti-Soviet" propaganda.

Actually, these Ukrainian intellectuals demanded recognition of and respect for the Ukrainian language and culture in Ukraine. And as one of the arrested, Ivan Kandyba, stated, they have come to the conclusion that "for the normal development of the Ukrainian nation and its statehood, Ukraine should secede from the USSR, according to Article 14 and Article 17 of the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, respectively, and should become an absolutely independent and sovereign state."

We bring this important information to your attention, Mr. Secretary, which proves undeniably that the Ukrainian people reject Communism, imposed upon them by an alien power. These arrests, involving a number of young intellectuals, many of them members of the Comsomol and the Communist Party, attest most convincingly to the failure of Communist Russia to destroy the undaunted spirit of the Ukrainian people and their ever-present belief in freedom, justice and equality of all peoples and races. The 45-million Ukrainian nation, although it lives in the so-called "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," which is a charter member of the United Nations, is deprived of the basic human and national rights, and Ukraine itself is a veritable colony of Communist Russia.

Therefore, in submitting to you this letter of protest against the persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals by the Soviet government in Ukraine, we would kindly request you to do the following:

1. To forward this information to the appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government so as to keep them informed about the unrest and persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals by the Soviet government. The widespread current dissatisfaction with the Communist rule in Ukraine only demonstrates the shaky and precarious hold Communists

Russia has over the restless and freedom-loving Ukrainian people.

2. To forward the contents of this letter to our Ambassador to the U.N. so that he is aware of the relentless persecution of the Ukrainian people, and to instruct him to challenge the Soviet Union in the international forum of the United Nations when an appropriate occasion affords itself, especially in rebutting the USSR in its boastful propaganda claims that it is helping the colonial peoples of Asia and Africa to achieve "nation liberation."

Some of the 200 Ukrainian intellectuals arrested in 1965-67 were released after intensive investigation and "questioning" by the KGB apparatus.

A list of names of those sentenced to longer terms at hard labor is attached hereto.

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President.

UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS IN SOVIET JAILS (Partial List)

The following list of names of Ukrainian intellectuals in Soviet prisons was compiled on the basis of a manuscript, Portrait of 20 Criminals, by Vyacheslav M. Chornovil, and a petition of Ivan O. Kandyba to Peter Y. Shelest, first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, which were smuggled out of Ukraine recently. Both authors are presently in Soviet jails.

1. Vyacheslav M. Chornovil, born on Dec. 24, 1937 in the Cherkassy area of Ukraine; literary critic, journalist and author whose two books, Recidivism of Terrorism or Justice, and Portrait of 20 Criminals are widely circulated in Ukraine in the form of a manuscript; he refused to testify against his colleagues at a secret trial; on Nov. 15, 1967 he was sentenced to 3 years at hard labor, but the sentence was reduced to 18 months; he is reported to be in a prison in Lviv.

2. Yaroslav B. Hevrych, born Nov. 28, 1937 in the Ternopil district, a student at Kiev Medical Institute; on March 11, 1966 he was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet nationalist propaganda and agitation." He is in Camp 17-A, in Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

3. Ivan A. Hel, an evening school student in Lviv; on March 25, 1966 he was sentenced to 3 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation"; at present he is serving his sentence in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

4. Bohdan M. Horyn, born Feb. 10, 1936 near Lviv; literary and art critic; arrested in August, 1965, he was tried on April 18, 1966 and sentenced to 4 years at hard labor; presently is in camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

5. Mykhailo M. Horyn, brother of Bohdan, born June 20, 1930; a psychologist; on April 18, 1966 he was sentenced to 6 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet propaganda." Presently incarcerated in Camp 1 and Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

6. Dmytro P. Ivashchenko, a member of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, lecturer on Ukrainian literature at the Lutsk Pedagogical Institute. In January, 1966 he was sentenced to 2 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet nationalist propaganda." Presently in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

7. Opanas I. Zalyvakha, born Nov. 26, 1925 in Husyntsi near Kharkiv; journalist and artist. In March, 1966 he was sentenced in Ivano-Frankivsk to 5 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation." Presently at Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

8. Svyatoslav Y. Karavansky, born in Odessa, Dec. 24, 1920; poet, linguist, journalist and translator; in 1944 he was sentenced to 25 years in a concentration camp, but freed in 1957. On Nov. 13, 1965 Karavansky was re-arrested and sentenced to 8 years and seven months at hard labor. Among his

translations from English into Ukrainian is Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre*. He is presently serving his sentence in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

9. Eugenia F. Kuznetsova, born in Shostka, near Sumy, Nov. 28, 1913, chemist by profession. On March 25, 1966 she was sentenced in Kiev to 4 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet agitation." She is very ill in Camp 6, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

10. Alexander E. Martynenko, born in Nova Horlivka, Donetsk, engineer at the Kiev Geological Institute. On March 25, 1966 he was sentenced in Kiev to 3 years at hard labor; presently in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

11. Mykhailo S. Masyutko, born Nov. 18, 1918 in Chaplyntsi, Kherson district; poet, literary critic and teacher; on March 23, 1966 he was sentenced to 6 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation." Now in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR, severely ill.

12. Valentyn Y. Moroz, born April 15, 1936 in Kholoniv, Volhynia, historian and lecturer. In January 1966 he was sentenced to 4 years at hard labor; at present in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

13. Mykhailo D. Ozerny, born in Verkhny Synevdy, near Lviv, in 1929, teacher, research work and translator. On February 7, 1967 he was sentenced to 6 years at hard labor, but later his sentence was reduced to 3 years, in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

14. Mykhailo H. Osadchy, born in Kurhany, Sumy region, on March 22, 1936; journalist, poet, literary critic and translator. A member of the Communist Party, and of the Union of Journalists of Ukraine; associate professor of journalism at the University of Lviv. His book, *Moon Fileds*, published in 1965 was confiscated and destroyed by the KGB. On April 18, 1966 he was sentenced to 2 years at hard labor, and is presently in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

15. Anatol Shevchuk, born on Feb. 6, 1937 in Zhytomyr, a writer, whose works appeared in a number of Ukrainian publications in Ukraine; on September 7, 1966 he was sentenced to 5 years at hard labor, is now in Camp 11, Yavas, Mordovian ASSR.

16. Maria Zvarychevska, born in Trebukhivka, near Ternopol, in 1936; an archivist in the Lviv Oblast Archive, she was sentenced to 8 months at hard labor; was released after serving her time.

17. Mykhailo V. Kolosiv, lecturer on Ukrainian literature at the Lviv State University, and literary critic, arrested but freed in 1966 because of heart ailment presently unemployed.

18. Ivan Rusyn, scientific worker at the Kiev Research Institute of Geophysics; was sentenced to 3 years imprisonment, but freed in the summer of 1966.

19. Mykola Hryn, research worker at the Institute of Geophysics of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev; sentenced to 3 years at hard labor.

20. Ihor A. Gereta, a scholar at the Institute of Geophysics, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, sentenced to 3 years at hard labor.

21. Theodosiy Y. Chubaty, a teacher at the Ternopil Music School, was sentenced to 4 years at hard labor.

22. Yaroslava Y. Menkush, born in 1923 in the village of Pustomyty, near Lviv; with secondary specialized education, a designer in light industry; a widow with a daughter; arrested on August 25, 1965, she was sentenced in March, 1966 to 2 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet agitation"; spent a year in Mordovia (Camp 17-A), as her sentence was reduced.

UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN JAILS SENTENCED BEFORE 1963

23. Catherine Zarytska, born in 1914, a Ukrainian Red Cross worker during World

War II; sentenced in 1947 to 25 years at hard labor; presently in the Vladimir Prison, northeast of Moscow.

24. Odarka Husak, also a Ukrainian Red Cross worker during the last war; was sentenced in 1950 to 25 years at hard labor; presently in the Vladimir Prison.

25. Halyna Didyk, organizer and worker in the Ukrainian Red Cross during World War II, was sentenced in 1950 to 25 years at hard labor; at present is in the Vladimir Prison.

26. Dr. Volodymyr Horbovy, a prominent Ukrainian defense attorney and a citizen of Czechoslovakia; he is serving a 20-year sentence in a camp in Dubravno, Mordovian ASSR.

27. Yuriy Shukhevych, son of General Taras Shukhevych-Chuprynska (commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army); in 1948 he was arrested at the age of 15, and sentenced to 10 years at hard labor; released in 1956, he was re-arrested the same year and sentenced by USSR Prosecutor General M. Rudenko to 2 years at hard labor; again, released in 1958, he was re-arrested and sentenced to 10 years at hard labor for "anti-Soviet propaganda."

28. Mykola Soroka, was arrested in 1940, and sentenced to 8 years at hard labor; released in 1948, he returned to Lviv, but was again arrested and sent to Krasnoyarsk for the same "crime"; upon return in Lviv in 1951, he was vindicated for the 1940 sentence; in 1952 he was arrested again and sentenced to 25 years at hard labor for membership in a "subversive" organization.

29. V. Duzhynsky, an artist, was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor in 1957 for hoisting a flag of the Ukrainian Zaporozhian Kozaks (of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries) in the Lviv Theater; presently in a camp in Dubravno, Mordovian ASSR.

30. S. Vyrun, was sentenced in 1961 to 11 years at hard labor for organizing "The Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union" in Lviv, which endeavored to seek more political and social freedom for the Ukrainian people; presently in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR.

31. M. Lukyanenko, was sentenced in 1961 to 15 years at hard labor for organizing the "Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union" in Lviv; presently in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR.

32. Ivan O. Kandyba, an outstanding writer and Communist theoretician who wrote a political treatise on Ukraine's rights within the USSR; in 1961 he was sentenced to 15 years at hard labor; also in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR, at present time.

33. Y. Dolishny, was sentenced for demanding a Ukrainian school for his children in Karaganda; his sentence is not known, but a group of Ukrainians were sentenced with him in Karaganda; presently in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR.

34. Dmytro Verkholak, a medical student, sentence unknown; at present in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR.

35. V. Levkovych, not closely identified; is serving his sentence in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR.

36. A. Hubyh, is serving his sentence in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR; his background and sentence are not known.

37. A. Novozhysky, also serving his sentence in the Dubravno camp, Mordovian ASSR; his background and sentence are unknown.

38. Bohdan Harmatiuk, born 1939, a technician with secondary specialized education; in March, 1959 was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor.

39. Yarema S. Tkachuk, born in 1933, a technician with secondary specialized education; in March, 1959 was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor.

40. Bohdan I. Tymkiv, born in 1935, a student at the Forestry Technical Institute in

Lviv, was sentenced in March, 1959 to 10 years at hard labor.

41. Myron Ploshchak, born in 1932, condemned to 10 years at hard labor in a closed court, in March, 1959.

42. Vasyl Ploshchak, brother of Myron, sentenced to 2 years at hard labor, for not reporting the membership of his brother in a secret organization.

43. Ivan V. Strutynsky, born in 1937, a choir director with secondary specialized education, sentenced in March, 1959 to 10 years at hard labor.

44. Mykola Yurchyk, born in 1933, was sentenced in March, 1959 to 7 years at hard labor.

45. Ivan Konevych, born in 1930, was sentenced to 7 years at hard labor in a closed court in March, 1959.

(All arrested—38 to 45—were charged with membership in the "United Party of Ukraine's Liberation." All were tried in a closed court on March 4-10, 1959 in Ivano-Frankivsk, formerly Stanislaviv.)

46. Ivan T. Koval, sentenced to death in December, 1961; was executed.

47. Bohdan Hrycyna, sentenced to death in December, 1961; was executed.

48. Volodymyr Hnot, a mechanic at the Polytechnical Institute, was sentenced to death, was subsequent commutation of sentence to 15 years at hard labor.

49. Roman Hurnyj, born in 1939, condemned to death, but his sentence was changed to 15 years at hard labor.

50. Hryhory Zelymash, a collective farm worker, was condemned in December, 1961, to 15 years at hard labor.

51. Oleksiy Zelymash, a collective farm worker, brother of Hryhory, was sentenced in December, 1961 to 12 years at hard labor.

52. Mykola Melykh, born in 1930, a student of philosophy at the State University in Lviv, was sentenced in December, 1961 to 15 years at hard labor.

53. Vasyl Kindrat, a young boy, was sentenced in December, 1961 to 13 years at hard labor (he became subsequently insane.)

54. Kyrylo (first name unknown), was sentenced in December, 1961 to 12 years at hard labor.

55. Mykola Mashtaler, was sentenced in December, 1961 to 10 years at hard labor.

56. Stepan Soroka, sentenced in December, 1961 to 15 years at hard labor.

57. Pokora (first name unknown), sentenced in December, 1961 to 12 years at hard labor.

58. K. Yovchik, sentenced in December, 1961 to 15 years at hard labor.

59. Kaspryshyn (first name unknown), sentenced in December, 1961 to 5 years at hard labor, released after serving his sentence.

60. Mynko (first name unknown), sentenced in December, 1961 to 10 years at hard labor.

61. Tehyvets (first name unknown), sentenced in December, 1961 to 12 years at hard labor.

62. Mykola Melnychuk, sentenced in December, 1961 to 10 years at hard labor.

63. Khomiakevych (first name unknown), sentenced in December 1961 to 12 years at hard labor.

(All the arrested—from 46 to 63—were tried in Lviv between December 16 and 23, 1961 on charges of belonging to a "Ukrainian National Committee," which was said to have advocated the secession of the Ukrainian SSR from the USSR.)

64. Bohdan Skira, a political prisoner (date of his sentence and also the term to which he was sentenced are unknown.)

65. V. S. Lutskevich, condemned along with Ivan O. Kandyba, a Ukrainian theoretician, in 1961 for belonging to the "Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union."

66. O. S. Libovych, sentenced (apparently) to 15 years at hard labor with the group of I. O. Kanyba in 1961.

67. Kipysh (first name unknown), sentenced with the Kandgba group in 1961.

68. Borovnytsky (first name unknown), also sentenced together with I. O. Kandyba for organizing a Ukrainian political party in 1961.

69. Kozyk (first name unknown), also a member of the Kandyba group, sentenced in 1961.

(All of the arrested—from 65 to 69—are kept in the prisoners' camp in the Mordovian ASSR.)

70. Mykhailo Soroka, born in 1911, was sentenced to 8 years at hard labor in 1940, and to 25 years in 1952.

71. Omelan Polevyl, born in 1913, was sentenced to 25 years at hard labor in 1945.

72. Hryhory Pryshlak, born in 1912, sentenced in 1946 to 25 years at hard labor.

73. Mykola Kostiv, born in 1915, sentenced in 1945 to 20 years at hard labor.

74. Eugene Pryshlak, born in 1913, sentenced in 1952 to 25 years at hard labor.

75. Bohdan Hermaniuk, born in 1931, sentenced in 1958 to 10 years at hard labor.

76. Ivan Ilchuk, born in 1925, sentenced to 25 years at hard labor in 1948.

77. Volodymyr Yurkiv, born in 1928, sentenced in 1947 to 25 years at hard labor.

78. Eugene Hladkovsky, born in 1930, sentenced to 25 years at hard labor.

79. Stepan Soroka, born in 1932, sentenced to 25 years at hard labor.

80. Vasyl Soroka, born in 1912, sentenced in 1961 to 15 years at hard labor.

81. Mykola Marciak, born in 1938, sentenced in 1962 to 10 years at hard labor.

82. Stepan Tyshkivsky, born in 1914, sentenced in 1952 to 25 years at hard labor.

83. Volodymyr Leoniuk, born in 1932, sentenced in 1951 and 1960 to 25 and 12 years at hard labor.

84. Vasyl Melnyk, born in 1923, sentenced in 1952 to 25 years at hard labor.

85. Hnat Kuzyk, born in 1933, sentenced in 1961 to 15 years at hard labor.

86. Vasyl Pirus (presumably a Ukrainian Catholic priest), born in 1921, sentenced in 1946 to 25 years at hard labor.

87. Denys Lukashevych, sentenced in 1949 to 25 years at hard labor.

88. Bohdan Khrystynych, born in 1929, sentenced in 1959 to 10 years at hard labor.

89. Yaroslav Hasluk, born in 1925, sentenced in 1960 (?) to 12 years at hard labor.

90. Ivan Struzynsky, born in 1937, sentenced in 1956 to 10 years at hard labor.

91. Mykhailo Orel, born in 1924, sentenced in 1947 to 25 years at hard labor, and then in 1952 again to 25 years at hard labor.

92. Mykhailo Levytsky, born in 1922, sentenced in 1951 to 25 years at hard labor.

93. Kozla (first name unknown), was sentenced in 1950 to 25 years at hard labor.

94. Oleksa Shekman, born in 1928, sentenced in 1955 to 25 years at hard labor.

95. Stepan Yankevych, born in 1922, sentenced in 1954 to 25 years at hard labor.

96. Hryhor Demchuk, born in 1930, sentenced in 1958 to 25 years at hard labor.

97. Mykola Marusiak, born in 1925, sentenced to 25 years at hard labor in 1948.

98. Mykola Pidhorodny, born in 1926, sentenced in 1949 to 5 years at hard labor, and in 1962 he was sentenced again to 7 years at hard labor.

The following Ukrainian political prisoners had been sentenced for unspecified "crimes" during World War II:

99. P. Stryk; 100. V. Nabok; 101. I. Shylha; 102. N. Zakharchenko; 103. H. Reva; 104. K. Samardak; 105. Ischenko (no first name—n.f.n.); 106. P. Drahomyrets; 107. D. Kuvalo; 108. I. Boyko; 109. K. Neniha; 110. I. Tkachuk; 111. Tyshchenko (n.f.n.); 112. Mykhallets (n.f.n.); 113. Bosachenko (n.f.n.); 114. Skrudnyk (n.f.n.); 115. Babrenko (n.f.n.); 116. Rudenko (n.f.n.); 117. Vasylikiv (n.f.n.); 118. Myronenko (n.f.n.); 119. Derkach (n.f.n.); 120. Ilchuk (n.f.n.); 121. A. Mysnyk; 122. Suk (n.f.n.); 123. Zhur

(n.f.n.); 124. Hladky (n.f.n.); 125. Sashalluk (n.f.n.); Semenenko (n.f.n.); 127. Krukovsky (n.f.n.).

Among the Ukrainian political prisoners there are a number who were sentenced for religious beliefs; some of these are:

128. Oleksa Kurdak; 129. Serhiy Ravliuk; 130. Volobuyev (n.f.n.); 131. J. Fusytei; 132. P. Kotyk; 133. P. Harchiy; 134. Yakuboy (n.f.n.); 135. Kulish (n.f.n.); 136. Matsipa (n.f.n.); 137. Nykolenko (n.f.n.)—all Jehovah's Witnesses;

138. Holovchenko (n.f.n.); 139. F. Si-renko—both Seventh Day Adventists;

140. Bezkhutryl (n.f.n.); 141. Kulbaba (n.f.n.); 142. A. Lashchenko; 143. Stepanov (n.f.n.) and 144. Hrytsai (n.f.n.)—of the Orthodox faith.

FOREIGN POLICY BEYOND VIETNAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATFIELD

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 18 the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] addressed the World Affairs Council in Philadelphia on the subject "Foreign Policy Beyond Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY BEYOND VIETNAM

With negotiations underway in Paris, it is a widely held assumption that Vietnam has been defused as a political issue. Despite the fact that over 3,500 Americans have died in Vietnam since the President's March 31 peace initiative, politicians and commentators have turned to other subjects and the fiery debate between hawks and doves has been suspended. But the primary issue of Vietnam will not be resolved in Paris and profound debate continues. It is focused on the question of America's role in the world and the use of our enormous power. This is, fundamentally, what the war in Vietnam is about.

But this issue would have been raised even if we had not chosen sides in this civil war in a small country in Southeast Asia. Vietnam is just a natural extension of our post-World War II foreign policy and if revolution had first erupted in Thailand or Guatemala or any number of other countries we could very well have involved ourselves there as we are now in Vietnam.

Since the beginning of the cold war we have intervened militarily in the internal affairs of other nations on an average of once every 18 months. We have often looked at these interventions as our duty bound response to moral imperatives. We have convinced ourselves and told the world that our interference in the affairs of other nations grew out of our determination for justice, self-determination, and freedom for all men. While these are obviously our ambitions for all people they are clearly not the major reason for our interventions. It was on the basis of cold war fears and our anti-communist diplomacy that we became involved in these crises. Ronald Steel made this observation very well in his outstanding book *Pax Americana*: "What American postwar intervention boils down to in practice is not intervention against injustice or poverty for its own sake, but intervention against com-

munist . . . It is not the virtues of freedom we are primarily worried about, but the dangers of Communism. Where injustice is combined with an absence of a communist problem, as in Haiti or Rhodesia (or Greece), we have been indifferent to the call of our moral imperatives. Where a communist problem exists, as in Vietnam, we have found the defense of freedom to be an unshirkable obligation, even if performed on behalf of a regime which may be as indifferent to freedom as the communist one it opposes. When we decide when to honor our moral duty, the label the oppressor wears is exceedingly important."

Anti-communist has been the fundamental principle of our foreign policy. This cold-war philosophy grew out of the very real threat the Soviet Union presented to Western Europe in the late 1940's. But whatever validity the ideology of anti-communism had at this period of time diminished with the changed character of the former monolithic communist movement. Yet, out of habit rather than insight we live in terror of our own suspicions and, like Don Quixote, dissipate our energies fighting some monsters but often neglecting confrontation with the real enemies.

The ideology of anti-communism cannot serve as the foundation for a viable foreign policy. First, it is basically a negative, reactionary approach to international affairs and as such we cannot sell it to other nations. Anti-communism, alone, keeps us constantly on the defensive trying to counter the other fellow's thrust rather than initiating our own. We become preoccupied and inhibited from undertaking positive programs. In the process, those things we stand for become defined in the negative. "Freedom" in this context becomes interpreted as the absence of communism. This conclusion is no more valid than saying that a man who does not have cancer is healthy.

Second, our foreign policy based on anti-communism often casts us in a role of helping to suppress the legitimate demands of many of the world's people for social, economic, and political justice. Our fear that Communists might exploit or capture any forceful movement dedicated to these goals has led us—as in Vietnam—to align ourselves with petty dictators and oppressive governments determined to preserve their power and privileges. We too often pledge our support to any government, regardless of its legitimacy, that dons the colors of anti-communism. Thus, we alienate the people of the world by helping to frustrate their hope for social and economic justice. This is very detrimental to our national interests and if we continue to pursue this policy we may well provide the fuel for the communist revolutions we fear. Our so-called "counterrevolutionary reflex" can be exploited by communists to convince desperate people that the U.S. favors the status quo and supports their oppressors. They will then have no one but the Communists to turn to for help.

Third, and most dangerously, a foreign policy based on anti-communism distorts our vision as to where the real threat to liberty lies. We have been engaged for two decades in a struggle to spare the liberty of men from the oppressions of communism and to protect our own security. We have remained frozen in our obsession with the cold war against communism and have failed to recognize a much more tangible and much more cruel threat to freedom: the hunger and poverty of two-thirds of the world's people.

The world food problem is only now getting the attention it has long deserved. It is estimated that 10,000 people—mostly children—die each day from starvation or the diseases born of malnutrition. Experts predict that if current trends persist, hundreds of millions will die in the 1980's because the combined resources of the world could not feed them. These are horrifying statistics. And this trend has been obvious for years

but we have been so preoccupied with the cold war that we have done little to forestall mass famine. Now, only the most optimistic predict that it is not too late to save millions from starvation. We have been shortsighted, I believe, in narrowly defining the nature of the threat to liberty in Communist aggression. We have failed to recognize that need and hunger can enslave a man as completely as the tyranny of communism. As Professor Ritchie Calder has observed, "Liberty is a word that rumbles meaninglessly in empty bellies."

But hunger not only denies liberty to the man that is starving, it threatens our own as well. Psychologists tell us that the prime motivating force in animals, including man, is the instinct for survival. In about half of the world today, and perhaps three-fourths of the world during the next decade, survival is directly equated with food. Those figures have an ominous and unmistakable meaning to the well-nourished nations. What are our prospects for survival in a world situation where reason and fellowship among men have been supplanted by the basic struggle for life and where all human relationships are reduced to a desperate battle for a limited amount of food? How likely is it that stable governments can be maintained in countries where a large part of the population is starving? And how stable is our world, and how secure is our liberty, when one portion of the world's population worries about eating too much while the larger portion worries about where the next meal is coming from? Revolutions, history counsels us, do not erupt out of a passion for blood-letting but out of impatience with suffering.

To borrow a slogan from the Second World War, "food will win the war and write the peace." It will be food—not guns or dollars—that will determine the future course of hungry nations. As President Marcos of the Philippines recently asserted, the development of food sources to feed the world "is a more important revolution than those being fought with guns." The future course of the world may well depend on how effective the United States—the most powerful and technologically advanced nation on earth—is in reordering her priorities. If we continue to spend our limited resources enlarging our capacity for nuclear over-kill, if our foreign policy remains focused on the diplomacy of anti-communism, mass famine and mass suffering are almost inevitable.

There are numerous fronts from which this problem must be attacked: One is population control. The tragic possibility of mass starvation cannot be ascribed as much to man's inefficiency in food production as to his greater efficiency in re-production. Between 1961 and 1965, the production of food in the less-developed countries rose about two percent yearly. At the same time, however, their population grew at three percent per year with the net result that every person had less each year to eat.

A large part of the answer to feeding a hungry world, then, lies in limiting the number of mouths to feed through methods of population control. It is for this purpose that I have cosponsored a bill in the United States Senate to make funds available to foreign countries seeking assistance in establishing voluntary birth control programs.

And we must accelerate our efforts to limit the world's birth rates. Population control, however, is a long-range objective. Future limitation of population growth will not affect the present food ration for those people already living and already at the point of starvation. By the end of the century, the number of people living in the already hungry regions of the world is expected to more than double. To feed this increase—of nearly 3 billion people—the less developed countries alone will need as much additional food as is now produced by all the farmers in the world.

The most promising possibility in increasing the food supply lies in harvesting the vast resources of the sea. Despite the fact that 71 percent of the world's surface is covered by oceans, only about one to two percent of the world's total food supply is now obtained from the sea. During the last decade the world's total fish yield increased from 29 million tons to 52 million tons. Various estimates predict that the world's fish catch could be further increased four to ten times without depleting this resource. Taking the conservative estimate of increasing the fish catch by four times would mean that the sea alone could produce enough animal protein in the form of a fish protein concentrate to provide the minimum annual needs of 24 billion people.

This is the potential but the United States has shown little inclination to capitalize on it. Since 1956, the United States has dropped from second to sixth place among the fishing nations of the world. While Peru, Japan, Mainland China, the USSR, and Norway have increased their landings sharply, the catch of American fishermen has decreased slightly during the last 10 years. Our fishing fleets have deteriorated in size and condition; at the same time we have spent billions upon billions of dollars on the space race. I have for sometime believed that our government must reorder its priorities. We must rationally decide if our goals of preserving liberty and promoting the well-being of man are better served through huge expenditures to beat the Russians to the moon or through developing methods to feed a hungry world. It seems a bit incongruous to perpetuate a situation where one part of the world competes for the moon while the other competes for a loaf of bread. I firmly believe that the greatest world prestige and favor will go to the nation that conquers hunger, not the nation that conquers outer space.

Analogies are always dangerous but permit me to draw one to emphasize how important it is to our well-being to not only commit ourselves to feeding the hungry but to helping the impoverished countries lift themselves economically into the modern world. We have in our own country a reflection of the world-wide disparity between the "haves" and the "have nots." For scores of years, white Americans have grown progressively richer and more comfortable while black Americans have, at least by comparison, grown poorer and more impoverished. As the economic gap between black and white communities has increased, so has the despair and anger of Negro Americans. As the black man's hope of narrowing this gap diminished, violence grew and we now face the very real threat of further revolution in our cities. There is open preaching by the militants that violence is the only way for the Negro minority to secure the economic benefits long denied them. The seeds for this violence at home have also been planted abroad and are being nurtured by the growing gap between the have and the have not nations. How long will it be before the southern half of our globe, awakened out of apathy by rising expectations, completely despairs of every being able to find enough to eat or of lifting itself out of poverty and resorts to force to get those things it so urgently needs?

Hunger and poverty are the reality of today's threat to peace. We betray our dedication to the liberty of men and jeopardize our own security by our obeisance at the altar of anti-communism.

The United States must reorient its foreign policy to meet these realities. The goals of our policy should be to prevent famine and encourage the granting of economic, social, and political justice to all men. I am convinced that this is the most hopeful way to stop the spread of communism. For poverty, and hunger, and injustice are the favorite breeding grounds of communism. We must

apply the same realism in the fight against communism that we used in the fight against malaria. Medical science was quick to realize that it was much more fruitful to concentrate on finding a way to prevent malaria rather than on devising a cure once an epidemic had broken out. On discovering that the mosquito was responsible for this disease, the doctors were wise enough to realize that they could not possibly kill every mosquito. Instead, they poisoned the swamps and destroyed their breeding ground. This is precisely the approach we must take in our foreign policy. We must drain the swamps of human misery and destroy the breeding ground of communism.

There are many policies that we could undertake to encourage economic progress in the developing nations. For one, we could drastically cut back on our military assistance program which consumes nearly one-half of our foreign aid budget. We must learn and help the developing nations to realize that you do not destroy the appeal of an ideology with hand grenades and bullets.

You do it through social and political reforms and through economic development.

We can do a great deal more than we are at present, to hasten economic development in those countries where there already exists a national commitment to progress. We must realistically accept the fact that progress cannot be superimposed on a country from outside. Among the policies we can adopt to encourage development is the expansion of incentives for the investment of private capital in foreign countries. We can make more funds available to international banks and loan programs where our money can be directed to worthy projects without all the political manipulations that accompany our programs of direct aid.

But unfortunately, pouring money on the problem will not solve it. We have learned that with our domestic programs. Economic growth can be stimulated with capital but just as important to this progress is the development of human resources. The developing countries need to have their manpower trained in hundreds of different skills and this training can only be done effectively on a person-to-person basis. It is here that the United States can make its most important contribution. No other nation on earth has the abundance or diversity of human skills that we have. And many Americans are anxious to share these skills. I am deeply convinced of the value of people-to-people programs—of the Peace Corps, of student and cultural exchange activities. Through such programs we can share our technical know-how. But that is not all we can share. We can share our dream of human dignity and freedom. Only through personal contact can we cultivate an understanding among men that we all have the same aspiration for peace, for brotherhood. Only when men begin to understand each other and recognize their "universal" ambitions for peace and equality can international relationships be based on cooperation instead of fear, on tolerance instead of suspicion.

Finally, a primary foreign policy goal should be the strengthening of the United Nations. Despite all our fine rhetoric about our obligations to defend freedom anywhere, the United States just does not have the resources to do this and we shall only destroy ourselves if we attempt to police the world. The maintenance of peace is properly the function of the United Nations. Unfortunately, the U.N. is not capable of undertaking this task at the present time. It does not have the authority to perform this function and the United States has often acted to retard the development of this authority. Our unilateral military intervention into the affairs of other nations, in violation of the U.N. charter, undermines this organization's ability to perform as collective security agency.

We must recommit ourselves to the principles of the U.N. Charter. We were the primary architect of this institution but after laying the foundation we threw away our blueprint and began improvising in our attempts to construct a world at peace. We must return to the original principles. Only when our national security is *directly* and immediately threatened—as in the Cuban missile crisis—should we act unilaterally. If our national security is not directly threatened, then we must make every effort to work through the United Nations. If internal turmoil in some nation threatens the peace, or if one country aggresses against another, we must work in concert with other great powers—hopefully through the United Nations. Above all, we cannot militarily intervene in civil wars out of fear of a communist takeover. From a purely pragmatic standpoint, Vietnam has demonstrated the terrible cost of such an undertaking and the difficulty of assuring that the end result will be worth the effort. From a moral standpoint we cannot long endure the sacrifice of our national soul that a policy of intervention requires. John Quincy Adams very prophetically counseled that America must not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy. He said: "The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. . . . She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

I know this will be very difficult for Americans to do. We were cast, unwillingly, as the protector of freedom following the Second World War. It is a role we did not want but are afraid to relinquish.

But we must accept the fact that violent revolutions are inevitable in Asia, Africa and Latin America as desperate people trade their lives for social, economic, and political justice. If we are wise enough to redirect our foreign policy in an attempt to stimulate economic development and encourage social and political reform, we may be fortunate enough to forestall some revolutions and temper others. But there is very little military politics can do to prevent these revolutions or to determine their outcome. We must accept the disheartening fact that, in some instances, Communists may very well come to power.

To accept this reality will require a very realistic re-evaluation of our national interests. We will have to train ourselves to look beyond the label of revolution or the ideology a government accepts. We will have to judge if our national interests are threatened on the basis of how hostile a country is to the United States and what its potential is for harming us. We cannot automatically assume that just because some small country in Asia, or Africa, or Latin America is communist that our security is at stake. We need to remember that despite the President's dire predictions of all of Southeast Asia falling like dominoes if tiny South Vietnam went under, the Administration was quite resigned to the likelihood of a communist takeover of Indonesia with its 200 million people and abundant resources. We also need to remember that nationalism, not communism, is the dominant force in the emerging countries and the fact that a small underdeveloped nation embraces Communist doctrine does not necessarily enhance the power of the Soviet Union or Communist China.

This will be a very bitter pill for Americans to accept. We know too well the horrors of communism. But we can take solace in the fact that countries, like individuals, can be rehabilitated. We need only look at the disintegration of the communist satellite system in Eastern Europe and their liberalization for confirmation. Finally, we have been able to live with the tyrannies and oppressions of our allies on the Far Right—such as Spain, Rhodesia, Haiti, and Greece. As long as those countries on the communist left

refrain from hostilities and threatening our security, we should also be able to live with their tyrannies and oppressions.

I would like to add one final thought. Our strongest appeal to the allegiance of other nations is our own "example." The developing world is trying very hard to emulate our economic and technological success. If we want them to also adopt our political system and to guarantee the rights and liberties of their citizens, we must provide them with a good example. The deficiencies in our society are only too visible to the rest of the world and until these can be corrected it is naive to hope that others will imitate our system. Our first priority must be to restore our own society and to attend to its injustices before we presume to tell others how to set their houses in order. We cannot hope to transplant the American Dream on foreign soil before it has become firmly rooted in our own.

DR. GODDARD ENDING HIGH-HANDED FDA REIGN

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DR. GODDARD ENDING HIGH-HANDED FDA REIGN

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Dr. James L. Goddard will be retiring in a few days as commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. He will leave behind him, after less than two-and-a-half years in office, a record of high-handed arrogance unmatched since the heady days of Harold Ickes.

The gentleman rushed upon the Washington scene in January of 1966, a basket of chips on each shoulder. A divine providence had endowed him with vast energy, but alas, with small judgment. Dr. Goddard began by denouncing the pharmaceutical manufacturers: They were afflicted with "the disease of irresponsibility." He raced off in 52 directions all at once, bringing suits, making speeches, ousting respected members of the staff, reorganizing his department. He made pronouncements on everything in sight—drug advertising, new drug applications, old drugs, Zen foods, bio-flavonoids, vitamins, marijuana, the corner drug store.

Yet it may be that the performance of the FDA under Dr. Goddard in the matter of dimethyl sulfoxide provides the best single memorial to the commissioner's imperial career. Congressman Wendell Wyatt of Oregon has summed up the record in one word: Persecution. The word is aptly chosen.

Dimethyl sulfoxide, known as DMSO, first appeared as a commercial solvent derived from wood manufacturing processes. Its nearly miraculous properties in the treatment of certain diseases began to be explored five years ago by Dr. Stanley W. Jacob, of the University of Oregon Medical School, and by other respected researchers in the field.

By the summer of 1964, six American pharmaceutical firms had started careful investigations. A European symposium on DMSO was held in Berlin in 1965. Japanese physicians undertook successful experiments with DMSO in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Around the world, evidence began to accumulate of DMSO's amazing value as a therapeutic agent against bursitis, scleroderma, shingles, and other painful conditions.

The evidence was overwhelming. In one case history after another, as Dr. Jacob has observed, physicians were able to see improvement within minutes after the drug had been applied. A typical patient with acute bursitis, unable to move his shoulder in any direction, would achieve "dramatic increase in range of motion at the end of a half hour."

It is important to emphasize that DMSO's value apparently is greatest in treatment of some of the most painful conditions known to the human body—conditions for which no drug nearly so effective ever has been found. Those who have experienced scleroderma, in person or in a family, will understand what relief from this suffering can mean.

This is important, too: The investigations made it clear that DMSO has a remarkably low toxicity. It is as safe, says Dr. Jacob, "as any drug I ever have used or seen in medicine."

But one experiment on laboratory animals, in which massive doses of DMSO were administered—doses far beyond anything that ever would be prescribed for humans—turned up damage to the lenses of the animals' eyes. On Nov. 11, 1965, the FDA suspended clinical testing.

This was the situation when Dr. Goddard took over. At once he knew all about it. The investigations were "half-baked." They were "completely out of hand." They were "illegal." It was immaterial to him that further symposia (in New York in March of 1966 and in Vienna the following November) confirmed the impressive findings. Petitions, evidence, professional papers left Dr. Goddard unmoved.

One year ago this month, DMSO was licensed for prescription use in Germany and Austria. But as Dr. Goddard leaves office, the drug remains virtually unavailable to sufferers in the United States. He has imposed such draconian restrictions on clinical testing that only a handful of individual patients have benefited. Running through the record is a sense of lese majeste. His supreme authority, and his supreme ego, were not to be challenged.

One thinks back to Dr. Goddard's speech to the drug manufacturers in Florida two years ago. They were "irresponsible," he said. If that particular shoe fits, perhaps Dr. Goddard would like to put it on as he walks out of office next week.

OEO RESPONDS TO 12 DEMANDS OF POOR PEOPLE'S CAMPAIGN

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am sure that all Members of Congress were deeply interested in the set of demands advanced by the leaders of the Poor People's Campaign.

The basic demands included: guaranteed employment, a guaranteed annual wage, access to capital as a means of full participation in the economic life of America, and greater grassroots participation in the planning of Federal anti-poverty programs by the beneficiaries of the programs.

One immediate result of discussions between the campaign leaders and officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity was to make available an additional \$25 million for such programs as the emergency food and medical service,

the Mississippi Headstart program, the older persons program, a housing program for migrant farmworker families, a farmers' co-op in Alabama, and neighborhood service centers along the Mexican border.

It is the hope of all Members of Congress, I am sure, that the emergency food program will mark the beginning of the end of the widespread hunger and malnutrition that victimize millions of Americans today.

One June 5, a delegation from the Poor People's Campaign presented a set of 12 specific demands to OEO. A few days later OEO's Acting Director, Bertrand M. Harding, responded to the 12 demands and expressed the hope that the responses will serve as a basis for further discussion between OEO and leaders of the poor people.

Because I am sure that this dialog between the representatives of the Nation's poor people and the heads of the Government's principal antipoverty agency will prove of great interest to Members of Congress, I ask consent that Acting Director Harding's reply to the Campaign's 12 demands be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1968.

Rev. RALPH DAVID ABERNATHY,
President, Southern Christian Leadership
Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR REVEREND ABERNATHY: The OEO welcomes the opportunity to open new and meaningful channels of communication with the Poor People's Campaign.

We believe that the initial statement and list of "requests" presented by the Poor People's Campaign will provide a foundation for free and frank discussion of all ideas, all differences and all criticisms.

You have come to us in good faith; we reply to you in the same spirit. Let this be only a beginning of new attempts at understanding, mutual respect and improved communication. If there is believed to be a communication gap between us, this gap must be bridged.

For the past four years poor Americans have felt that they can come to OEO openly and freely to express their opinions, their petitions, their hopes and grievances. We also want to note that much of a substantive nature has been accomplished in these few short years: Programs like Head Start, Upward Bound, Legal Services and Neighborhood Health Centers have all grown out of the War on Poverty, each with full participation and endorsement of the poor themselves.

OEO takes its role as advocate for the poor very seriously. We recognize that our ability to help communicate the needs and the demands of the poor to other agencies of government and to other segments of our society is dependent upon our capacity to understand fully those needs and demands.

Therefore, I welcome the opportunity to enter a continuing dialogue with you and with the poor whom you represent. We stand ready at all times to consider your proposals and ideas, to help answer your questions, to clarify any misconceptions, to find ways mutually to advance the elimination of poverty.

The channels of communication to OEO will remain open at all times to all poor Americans. Let the following responses serve

as a starting point in discussions between us.

Sincerely,

BERTRAND M. HARDING,
Acting Director.

DEMAND 1

We demand that the OEO reorder its priorities so that the consumers of services be involved in the policy making, the technical assistance, and employment levels of those programs which continue to be administered by the agency.

Maximum feasible participation of the poor has been and remains a high priority at the Office of Economic Opportunity. Over the past four years we have made substantial and meaningful progress towards that goal. We recognize that this is a development process at all levels—local and national. But as a result of efforts made to date:

More than 50 percent of the employees of more than 1,000 local community action agencies (CAAs) are nonprofessional residents of the areas served—who were poor until employed. About 85,000 nonprofessionals were employed by local poverty programs in the last fiscal year in both full and part time jobs.

In the area of policy, more than 51,000 representatives of poor people are sitting on the governing boards of local CAA poverty programs, policy advisory committees, and neighborhood advisory groups. About 10,000 are serving on CAA governing boards—representing about one-third of the total membership. Some 30,000 poor people are serving on neighborhood advisory committees. Some 11,000 are serving on policy advisory committees where they represent 42 percent of the membership. These figures do not include the thousands of representatives of poor people serving on the boards of delegate agencies to local CAAs.

These facts are offered because they constitute our point of reference in seeking greater involvement in policy making and employment.

Now, as to the demand itself:

The Community Action Program is instituting a system by which drafts of major policy instructions will be circulated for comment to all grantees and national organizations interested in community action before becoming official. Representatives of the poor on CAA boards and advisory councils shall thus have a chance to discuss policy and make their views known to OEO before the policy is formally adopted.

OEO has had a Community Representatives Advisory Council (CRAC) since 1966, composed of representatives of the poor from each of seven regions. Its services and contributions have been significant both to the participants and to OEO. The Council has been undergoing a reorganization so that membership on it will become rotating rather than permanent. At its forthcoming meeting in June, consideration will be given to the establishment of CRACs at the OEO regional level.

Technical assistance

The OEO will involve the poor as consultants in OEO program development, monitoring and evaluations and we will recommend that State Economic Opportunity offices retain poor people in their technical assistance and evaluation operations. We would welcome further suggestions on how poor people could be involved in technical assistance.

Employment

The OEO will continue its efforts to see that qualified neighborhood workers and other poor people are employed in positions dealing with planning, operating, coordinating, analyzing and evaluating Community Action Programs. CAAs will be instructed to

give primary consideration for higher level jobs to poor people who have demonstrated their effectiveness in working with residents, even though they may lack formal education and the type of experience that is often required.

DEMAND 2

We call on OEO to issue regulations implementing citizen participation from poverty communities. This must be done without delay to bring the voice of the poor to those chambers where public officials now control OEO programs.

Our draft regulations on participation of the poor in OEO programs will be circulated for comment and proposed modifications to local community action agencies, other grantees, and various national organizations, including the SCLC. These proposed regulations spell out the responsibilities of local poverty programs toward the poor, and of the poor in the programs. Once adopted, a brief, simple summary of these regulations will be distributed widely in poverty communities. We are considering printing this simplified summary in "notice" format so that it can be posted in public places in the neighborhoods where it will be seen by a maximum number of people. We welcome any comments and suggestions on the regulations and how they can best be disseminated and implemented.

As you know, the reason for the new regulations is that the 1967 amendments to our legislation spell out in great detail how the poor can participate. These new provisions are contained in 19 separate references to the involvement of the poor. They constitute a mandate that must be fulfilled by local community action agencies in carrying out the basic purpose of community action—to achieve a better focusing of all available resources to help poor people. We are acutely aware of the importance of these provisions.

For example, in Section 212(b)(4), the legislation says the local CAA must establish "effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources."

Those words mean that local poverty programs must help poor people obtain the means to help themselves. That philosophy has been and continues to be OEO's creed. The proposed regulations would strengthen procedures for insuring that the voice of the poor is heard. And they will be written in language which will make perfectly clear the rights and duties of poor citizens. OEO will monitor closely the manner in which CAAs implement these guidelines, and performance will become an important criterion for continued OEO support of local programs.

DEMAND 3

We call on OEO to issue and implement a clear and simple appeals procedure that can be understood by the poor.

This demand seems to be directed mainly to Section 604 of the OEO legislation which calls on OEO to provide appeals procedures. We will complete shortly a regulation spelling out an appeals procedure for an agency or organization seeking to serve as a delegate agency whose application has been rejected by the local community action agency, or has not been acted upon within a reasonable period of time. OEO has had, since 1965, an appeals procedure developed under earlier legislation (CA Memos 9 and 9A).

At present, community action agencies are required by Community Action Memo 23A to establish appeals or grievance procedures

on personnel questions. The new CAP Form 75 on CAA Board Composition and Compliance, requires a CAA to indicate the organizations represented on its Board as well as those groups and organizations which applied for and were denied representation. The public hearing required by CAP Memo 80 enables poor people to express themselves on the designation of a CAA, and records of these hearings must be preserved for review by OEO if requested.

Also CAP Memo 81, defining the powers of CAA administering boards (the principal representative board where the local political jurisdiction has named itself the CAA), affirms the right of the administering board to "communicate directly with OEO at any time concerning matters of current importance."

OEO is developing a clear and simple statement as to how any person who encounters racial or ethnic discrimination in connection with any OEO programs can proceed to have it corrected. The statement will be printed in both Spanish and English.

In addition to all of the above procedures, poor people are encouraged to continue to express themselves directly to OEO regional offices and Headquarters if they have complaints about the operation of OEO programs or programs delegated by OEO to other Federal agencies.

DEMAND 4

We call on OEO to spell out requirements that will clearly make local politicians responsible for respecting the civil and human rights of the poor. This step is essential in those cases where the local political authority refuses to participate in the CAP Program or where the CAP agency is not responsive to the needs of the poor. If these programs exist, poor people must be able to operate their own programs.

Under existing legislation, a political jurisdiction may designate the existing CAA or some other public or private non-profit agency as its community action agency; or it may designate itself as the CAA.

Where the existing CAA or some other non-profit agency is chosen, the agency must be responsive to a Governing Board, made up of at least one-third representatives of the poor, with full decisionmaking authority.

If the jurisdiction should designate itself as the CAA, an administering board, again made up of at least one-third poor people, must be established to advise the local authorities and make such decisions as are delegated to it. CAP Memo 81 makes clear that "the administering board shall assist the governing officials to establish effective procedures and arrangements enabling the poor and area residents concerned to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing for technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources."

Furthermore, that Memo states that "flagrant violation of the above standards or consistent disregard of the views of the administering board and other institutions representing the poor within CAAs may result in partial or total loss of funding under Title II, or revocation of OEO recognition of the CAA under Section 210 (a) of the Act."

Also, under Section 211(d) (2) of the Act, CAAs must establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the community action board or governing board may petition for adequate representation.

Finally, under Section 210(d) the Director of OEO can designate and provide financial assistance directly to a community action agency where he determines that the CAA

serving the community has failed to submit a satisfactory plan for a community action program or has failed to carry out such a plan satisfactorily or where the political jurisdictions refuse to designate an agency. OEO will prepare and circulate a pamphlet spelling out in plain and simple language the rights and responsibilities of local political jurisdictions, CAAs, and the poor themselves under this new legislation. Further, the area of resident participation of the poor in OEO programs will be covered in the new regulations alluded to in response to Demand 2.

DEMAND 5

We will call on OEO to establish firm guidelines for the regional offices. Despite new authorities vested in the regional offices Washington officials must not abdicate all responsibility for programs.

The War on Poverty is in large measure a local effort. Federal bureaucrats cannot win the war from Washington. The regional offices furnish a necessary link between local anti-poverty efforts and the Washington offices of OEO. Independent studies have shown regionalization to be vital to the effective administration of this program.

Washington has not abdicated its responsibility. The overall policy of the War on Poverty is made in Washington. Regional offices then carry out day-to-day operations based on that policy. Additionally, Washington monitors regional office activities to insure that national policy is being implemented.

We would welcome the opportunity to review with you any specific problems which you might have encountered with the regional offices.

DEMAND 6

We call on OEO to publicly support the \$75 million summer jobs, the \$25 million Head Start supplemental appropriation, and the general \$279 million supplemental appropriation.

The basic reason for funding shortages in Office of Economic Opportunity programs during Fiscal 1968 is the reduction Congress made in the President's requested budget.

It should be clearly understood that both the Fiscal 1968 and Fiscal 1969 budget problems are part of the general fiscal situation now being debated in Congress. We are primarily concerned at this late date in the fiscal year that Fiscal 1969 expenditure reductions will not be made causing cutbacks in program levels.

The President has requested and OEO is seeking the full \$2.18 billion authorized by the Congress for Fiscal 1969. We will continue to press for the increase of \$407 million over the Fiscal 1968 appropriation and we are hopeful that the Congress will respond favorably. In addition, to paying the full year costs of operating levels reached at the end of Fiscal 1968 including funding for such expanding programs as the 45 Comprehensive Health Centers, this increase will permit several major program expansions:

Job Corps

Initiation of 5 inner city skill centers.
Increase Women's Center capacity by 690 slots.

Institution of follow-up on all Job Corps enrollees after they graduate.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

9,000 more summer jobs.

Job opportunities in the business sector
(JOBS)

37,100 more jobs slots.

Concentrated employment program (CEP)

11,300 more job slots.

Special impact

Fund 115% more new projects than in Fiscal 1968.

Head Start Follow Through

Serve 66,000 more children.

Upward Bound

Serve 6,500 more students.

Locally initiated community action programs

Double family planning.

Start 7 to 12 new Housing Development Corporations.

Expand rural area programs.

Increased neighborhood center programs.

Migrants

Add 7,000 adults to job-oriented education and training programs.

400 more units of self-helping housing.

DEMAND 7

We call on OEO to monitor the budgets of delegate Federal agencies so funds that could be used are not returned to the Treasury. Last year \$52 million from the Neighborhood Youth Corps was returned to the Treasury. This must not happen again.

OEO cannot at this time verify the exact amount of Neighborhood Youth Corps money to be returned to Treasury. The \$52 million involves appropriations from three fiscal years (1965-1967) and represents the maximum amount that would be returned.

OEO, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Labor are working jointly to develop improved contracting, accounting, and reporting procedures to insure operational control of contract funding.

The Department of Labor has assured us that adequate control procedures are being instituted. To guard against the loss of funds, the Department of Labor will use improved procedures in new contracts, for both new and old projects, to be authorized during Fiscal 1969, beginning July 1.

DEMAND 8

We call on OEO to restructure and convene the OEO Citizens Advisory Council and give to the poor stronger and broader representation on this Council. OEO must maintain communication with representatives of the poor and with those private groups concerned with the anti-poverty program.

The Economic Opportunity Act limits the National Advisory Council to 21 members, appointed by the President, and "representative of the public in general." The Council was carefully selected to represent various segments of society. Negro, Indian and Mexican-American representatives sit on the Council as do spokesmen for other important groups.

OEO will give careful consideration to ways and means of making this representation even broader and we will gladly review any specific suggestions which the Poor People's Campaign might have.

DEMAND 9

We demand that all programs delegated by OEO to other Federal agencies contain strong provisions for OEO to monitor and evaluate programs. OEO must set up procedures so that the poor are an integral part of all evaluations.

The most significant delegation of OEO programs is to the Department of Labor. Under its delegation agreement with the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity reserves to itself the right to monitor and evaluate all aspects of a delegated project with the single exception of evaluation to determine general contract compliance.

The delegation of Title I-B to Department of Labor states that the prime sponsor of manpower programs must provide for the participation of area residents in the planning, administration, coordination, and evaluation of the Work and Training Programs. Also, the supplier of manpower services in a Work and Training Program must employ the poor as subprofessionals in the planning, conduct and evaluation of the manpower components.

As an advocate of the poor, OEO views the involvement of the poor as a key factor

in its evaluations. As we have indicated in a prior response, poor people will soon be involved in making evaluations of OEO programs. We would welcome additional suggestions from the Poor People's Campaign on other ways to use poor people in the evaluation of delegated programs.

DEMAND 10

We demand that the agency make available a plan for its future organizational structure.

In the foreseeable future, this agency expects to remain as presently constituted. OEO invites the Poor People's Campaign to spell out any organizational problems of OEO which are believed to affect anti-poverty efforts adversely or changes which might be beneficial.

DEMAND 11

We demand that the Economic Opportunity Council be activated and an executive director be appointed (as provided by law) with the concurrence of the Citizens' Advisory Council. OEO must insist that the now fragmented anti-poverty effort of a variety of Federal agencies be coordinated through itself and the EOC. OEO is the symbol of the Federal anti-poverty efforts of all Federal agencies.

The 1967 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act made substantial changes in the composition and role of the Economic Opportunity Council. We have been working on implementation of those amendments since their enactment late last December. We anticipate an early decision on this matter.

DEMAND 12

We demand that programs which do not meet quality standards must be defunded and the funds made available to other groups in the community. Lack of involvement of the poor must be considered prima facie evidence of lack of quality.

Programs have been and will continue to be defunded when deficiencies—including non-involvement of the poor—are not being corrected within the existing structure. Resident participation is of paramount importance in the operation of community action programs and the OEO directives that relate to such participation will, as always, be vigorously enforced.

However, the defunding of a community action agency for any reason is a measure of last resort. Those who suffer most from the resulting loss of funds are the poor themselves. The time, money and effort that go into a program are valuable resources that must be protected, if at all possible. For that reason, where deficiencies do appear, OEO believes that the basic purpose of the program—to help the poor help themselves—is served by working to correct those deficiencies.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of most Americans today is the ever increasing incidence of crime in this country. Bill Young, director of programming for radio station KILT in Houston, Tex., prepared a series of editorials on this concern and they have been broadcast daily.

I insert two of these editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time so that we might all benefit from the thoughts expressed in them:

[KILT editorial, Houston Tex., June 21-24]

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

We have heard our leaders talk about the lack of respect for law. Let's talk, though, about the lack of respect for our lawmen.

For a moment, consider what is your overall image of a policeman . . . your children's image of a policeman.

They are forced to deal with the lowest form of our society every day, the killers, the rapist, the dope addicts. When they go to work they never know if they'll be shot while answering a routine call.

We pay this man only a fair salary, tie his hands to a point where it is virtually impossible for him to do his job, we even get angry if we get a traffic ticket. Then, we ask him why he can't stop violence when it occurs in our cities.

The most recent example of law enforcement hindrance by recent Supreme Court decisions concerns the killing of 22-year-old Mary Mitchell, right here in Houston. She was murdered for no apparent reason as she drove her car on the Eastex Freeway the morning of May 25. A shotgun blast was fired from another moving auto through the window of her car striking her in the head, killing her instantly.

Police arrested and charged two teen-agers, aged 16 and 17. They admitted to officers they killed the woman but did not sign a written confession. Harris County District Attorney Carroll Vance was forced to ask a district court to dismiss the murder charge because of the Supreme Court ruling that an oral confession cannot be admitted as evidence in a court trial.

And we ask . . . why can't policemen stop the crime in America!

[KILT editorial, Houston, Tex., June 19-24]

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

A number of national news commentators have blamed the lack of stiff gun control legislation. For weeks since the tragic events in Los Angeles and Memphis, they have called for a public demand to Congress to do something about the "guns". Is this the answer? One bill now before the Congress would require that every gun be registered. It was a licensed gun that was used to assassinate Robert Kennedy. We license all the cars in the United States but that doesn't seem to lessen the tragic number of people who are killed on our highways.

Gun registration would be a costly project, requiring a great deal of red tape and expense that might be put to better use in increased police enforcement of existing gun laws. Some people have suggested banning private ownership of firearms completely. Is this the answer? Twenty years ago we had as many guns per capita as we have today but, less gun crimes. Maybe, it's our society that has changed.

Look at the Amateur Trapshooting Association, for example. In the 50 year history of the "gun-owners" organization, not one single member has been involved in a gun violation, or, a gun accident, for that matter. Police records show that almost no juvenile delinquent possesses a hunting license.

Sportsmen are for gun control . . . in the form of enforcement of existing gun laws.

Let's impose heavy penalties for the possession of a "concealed" weapon. . . . Maybe that's the answer.

THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the use of American highways continues to grow

year by year, making it apparent that we will never finish the job of building roads and highways in this country. Ross G. Stapp, superintendent of the Wyoming Highway Department and first vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, recently presented a paper representing the major views of that organization and of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, which he heads as president.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stapp's paper, presented to the Western Interstate Committee on Highways and Transportation, in Phoenix, Ariz., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINUATION OF PRESENT HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(By R. G. Stapp, superintendent, Wyoming Highway Department, first vice president of AASHO, president of WASHO, chairman of AASHO Transportation Committee, presented to Western Interstate Committee on Highways and Transportation, Phoenix, Ariz., April 29, 1968)

It is a pleasure for me to appear before the Western Interstate Committee on Highways and Transportation today. You are an influential group in the consideration and formulation of highway programs, and we appreciate your interest, and we thank you for your support.

Highway usage continues to grow rapidly. In 1955, when the Interstate system was being planned, the 63 million registered vehicles in the U.S. traveled 590 billion vehicle miles. By 1965, 90 million vehicles were registered, and 887 billion vehicle miles were being traveled.

One fact is apparent from this pattern—our system of streets and highways will never actually be "completed." Continuing growth in population and the economy will result in even more vehicles and vehicle miles traveled and will generate the need for better streets and highways.

Highways are a vital element of our national economy. In 1965, our total transportation costs, that is, costs of the traveled way, the conveyance medium and the costs of their operation amounted to 20 per cent of the Gross National Product. Roads and vehicles make up 83 per cent of the transportation total. A dynamic economy such as ours can never afford to slow down or to stop the process of highway improvements.

Federal aid for highways has grown from \$5 million in 1917 to an authorized \$4.8 billion for 1969. But even more significant than the dollar figure is the federal share of all highway finances. In 1921, federal aid represented nine per cent of all capital outlay and six per cent of all highway expenditures. In 1967 it accounted for nearly half of the total \$9.2 billion of capital outlays and over one-fourth of the \$14.2 billion total street and highway expenditures.

The Department of Transportation estimates that the growth of travel during the 20-year period from 1965 to 1985 will represent an increase of 60-100 per cent over that existing in 1965. The most likely projection, based on moderate levels of growth in the economy and in other factors influencing travel is 71 per cent, an average annual rate of 3.6 per cent. Personally, I feel that this emphasizes the importance of planning the future program now to insure the highway user will receive optimum results from the taxes he pays.

It was my understanding from Senator Barron, that you are interested in the attitude of the American Association of State Highway Officials with regard to the future of the highway program, and that you also are

interested in the thinking of the Western Association of State Highway Officials concerning other highways which are a part of the overall transportation system in the Western states.

Probably the most significant factor in the AASHO opinion regarding the "After '75" highway program is that it does give due considerations for the problems of the several states.

I think it will be informative here to give you a few pertinent points taken from the statement I presented on behalf of AASHO to the Roads Sub-committee of the House Public Works Committee on February 21:

"As you know, we started on the Interstate program with a sizeable backlog of ABC System needs, which have been held in abeyance, and we have added to those needs from that time until now, and will continue to do so.

"Most of our financial capabilities have been going towards the construction of the very important 41,000-mile Interstate system.

"In 1956, the top priority highway needs of this Nation was a network of freeways, inasmuch as our major traffic streams were getting so dense that the conventional dual-purpose Primary highway could no longer satisfy the long distance and the local needs efficiently and safely.

"We, therefore, allotted the major portion of our federal aid funds to the number one priority need, so that the Nation's economy could expand and so that National Defense could be enhanced by having this system of Interstate freeways across the Nation.

"We, of the state highway departments, have been looking forward to the day that the 41,000-mile Interstate program is completed, so that we can then turn our financial resources to modernizing our vast Primary highway system that serves the whole country, and in taking care of our growing urban highway transportation requirements.

"We also must continue an adequate land service farm-to-market program, for it is also essential to our economic health.

"To us, then, as soon as we can possibly complete our 41,000-mile Interstate program, our top priority consists of modernizing the Primary system, satisfying our growing urban requirements, and continuing an adequate Secondary program.

"At the present time, we see no substantial increases in highway revenues, so it appears that we will have to finish the Interstate program before we can start out on this big backlog of growing highway needs on our ABC Systems.

"The state highway administrators are unanimous in their hopes that we can finish the 41,000-mile Interstate network and not add to that mileage, either now or later, for to do so will continue to put off the day when we can turn our financial resources to modernizing our Primary system, which includes the replacement of a number of substandard bridges, and address our attention to taking care of urban problems. In upgrading the Primary system, those qualifying will be to freeway standards. Others will be expressways or vastly improved two-lane facilities.

"As soon as the 41,000-mile System is completed, and any substandard sections in it corrected, we would like to drop the 90-10 matching ratio, and have a uniform matching ratio for all federal-aid system programs, based on the capabilities of the composite state highway departments to match the federal funds, but with the sliding scale provisions continuing for the Public Land States."

It is imperative here to note there are different types of states when considering finances. Before I outline the policies of AASHO regarding the "After '75" program, it is first necessary to define some terms relative to the various types of states in the

highway program. A large percentage of states in the western and midwestern sections of the country are "bridge" states, as far as motor travel is concerned. We form links to carry traffic from one region to another. The tourist enroute from Chicago to the Pacific Northwest uses the road system of several "bridge" states to reach his destination.

The problems of "bridge" states are very often unappreciated in financing our highway system. "Bridge" states are principally those through which traffic travels from one densely populated area to another.

Two other terms are relevant here—"donor" states and "subsidy" states. A "donor" state is one in which the volume of fees generated by motor vehicle travel exceed immediate needs. A "subsidy" state conversely is one in which motor vehicle fees are insufficient to construct an adequate highway system. Hence, "donor" states contribute to the construction of highways in "subsidy" states, and more particularly, in "bridge" states.

My personal recommendations to our AASHO committee on the continuation of the highway program very closely coincide with the official policy statement of John O. Morton, president of AASHO and Commissioner of the New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways. Mr. Morton outlined AASHO's position in an address to the National American Road Builders' Association convention in Las Vegas last February. In stating the AASHO policy, Mr. Morton said:

"The American Association of State Highway Officials will strongly urge Congress to not only continue but expand the present federal aid highway program. In suggesting an expansion of the program, AASHO will offer Congress the following recommendations for its consideration:

"1. That completion of the present Interstate network be accomplished at the earliest possible date. Only when this system is in full operation will it function efficiently to provide the total service it has been designed for.

"2. That no additional mileage be added to the Interstate highway system either now or upon its completion. Our highway needs studies do, however, show that in many areas of our country there is a need for more primary arterial highways or expressways.

These new arterials should be located to provide better connections among all of our major cities. Inside the metropolitan areas of this Nation, we refer to those areas of 50,000 or more in population, there is also a need for added arterial highways; however, AASHO will strongly urge that many of the existing major highways contained within our metropolitan areas be upgraded to provide greatly expanded traffic service through such expedients as the Traffic Operations Program to Increase Capacity and Safety (TOPICS) program.

"In our country we presently have some 231 so-called metropolitan areas. Of this number, we foresee some 12 to 15 major cities as being in real need of developing or expanding mass rail transit systems. However, for the great majority of our metropolitan areas, AASHO strongly recommends the full utilization of buses. Buses are more flexible than rail transit. They are much less expensive to operate and can be made increasingly attractive to the commuter. We envision that, in the future, certain highway lanes will be assigned exclusively to buses, particularly during the peak hours of travel. We see an urgent need for express arteries connecting the major airports with the core of the large city. We envision that, in the future, large parking areas will rim the core of the city with fast express buses connecting conveniently located terminals in the heart of the city.

"3. In addition to an arterial highway pro-

gram being constructed through rural areas to connect our major cities, the improvement of our farm-to-market roads made possible through our present Secondary road program must be continued at an expanded level.

"To accomplish these objectives, AASHO recommends the following:

"1. Continue the Highway Trust Fund as it is presently established. Do not, in any degree, intermingle funds for other forms of transportation with the Trust Fund. It is a fund dedicated to highways. It is paid by the highway user and its integrity must be retained.

"2. Once the Interstate system is completed, abolish the so-called 90-10 matching formula or 50-50 matching formula as they now exist. Make all federal highway funds available to the states on a uniform matching basis. AASHO suggests a two-thirds—one-third matching ratio. This will automatically expand the highway program.

"3. In recognition of the dynamic growth taking place in our urban and suburban areas, we recommend the following division of the Highway Trust Fund:

"a. Apply five per cent of the total Trust Fund to the necessary upgrading of the Interstate highway network. This money to be allocated on a needs basis.

"b. Take 10 per cent of the total Trust Fund and establish it as a special urban fund. Earmark this money for application to a new urban system that would embrace 10 per cent of the total mileage of highways contained in cities of over 50,000 population, such a system to be designated through mutual agreement by city, state and federal officials. Allocation of money to this new urban system would be on population basis. The matching of this federal money would be determined by local legislation with the design and execution of the program remaining a function of the state highway department.

"c. Of the total of the Trust Fund remaining for distribution, we would allocate 30 per cent to the urban highway system as we now know it to be, namely to cities of over 5,000 population. Forty-five per cent would be allocated to our federal aid primary or arterial system as it now exists, and 25 per cent would go to the federal aid secondary system as we presently know it to be.

"d. AASHO further suggests that greater flexibility be brought into the program by allowing a 50 per cent transfer of funds among the components of the so-called ABC network.

"e. In apportioning funds to the respective states, highway officials are currently studying several formulas in an attempt to provide fair and just treatment to each individual state. For the allocation of funds to the urban areas, population must be the major factor. For the primary and secondary programs, we seek equitable solutions that take into consideration area, post road mileage and a tamper-proof highway needs formula. This constitutes a new approach to apportionment, and I can report that highway officials are working harmoniously in a spirit of cooperation and with a sincere desire to develop an answer that will lead the way to greater total progress. The basis for federal apportionment to the states is still under study, but until this is resolved, we will continue to use the present apportioning formula."

It is the consensus of the majority of chief administrators of the highway departments that financing at the state level will take care of itself in the future. The need for highways is so great that the local citizenry and highway user will probably be agreeable to additional highway user taxes to keep up with new construction and new highways. This is especially true if the matching ratio is changed and special consideration is given to those states which have a large portion of federal lands.

You will note that no mention has been made in the AASHO statement on federal lands money or forest highways. Highway administrators generally agree that these roads pertain to only certain states and the promotion for these funds has been left to the states which are vitally interested such as the states within the WASHO organization.

However, AASHO did take the stand that the monies for the construction of Forest highways and Federal Lands highways should come from the general fund and not be paid for out of the Trust Fund.

At the last regular session of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

"RESOLUTION NO. 2

"Whereas, forest highways promote utilization of resources on the national forests and provide recreational enjoyment for people from all states; and

"Whereas, forest highways are integral links in principal highway systems of the United States; and

"Whereas, the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

"Whereas, demands of additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements will raise the costs of construction; and

"Whereas, the rate of construction of forest highway sections of these extremely important Federal aid routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Western Association of State Highway Officials in conference assembled at Honolulu, Hawaii, July 14, 1967, urgently requests the Congress of the United States to increase the authorization and annual appropriation for forest highways from the present level of \$33,000,000 to the amount of \$85,000,000 beginning with fiscal year 1970; and

"Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Representative in each of the States in the WASHO Conference.

"RESOLUTION NO. 3

"Whereas, Public Lands Highways are a vital and integral link in the principal highway systems of the Western States; and

"Whereas, Public Lands Highways promote utilization of the resources on the lands owned by the Federal Government and provide recreational access for people from all of the states; and

"Whereas, the President of the United States and the National Congress have indicated an urgent need for more consideration of the beauty and scenic values of national road and highway systems; and

"Whereas, the rate of construction of the Public Lands sections of these extremely important Federal-aid routes has not kept pace with a rate of development commensurate with other sections; and

"Whereas, demands for additional elements in road construction in the form of scenic and recreational requirements have raised the costs per mile of completed highway; and

"Whereas, the present procedure for apportioning Public Lands Highway funds limits even short-range planning for the most economical use of awarded funds;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the fourteen states of the Western Association of State Highway Officials in conference assembled at Honolulu, Hawaii, July 14, 1967, urgently request the Congress of the United States (1) to increase the annual authorization and annual appropriation for Public Lands Highways from the fiscal year 1969 level of \$16,000,000 to \$35,000,000 in fiscal year 1970 and \$50,000,000 in fiscal year 1971 and maintain it at least at that level until Public Lands Highways are substantially

completed; and (2) to provide for advance apportionment of funds by an appropriate formula so that the states can better plan the work; and

"Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Director of the Budget, Secretary of Transportation, Secretary of the Interior, and Senators and Representatives from each of the States in the WASHO Conference."

These two resolutions are self-explanatory, and we do request their support by your committee. The WASHO states are unanimous in the feeling that the Highway Trust Fund should be continued as such and the revenue in the Trust Fund should be used exclusively for the purpose for which it was intended when the Act was passed in 1956. We also request your support of this philosophy. Both AASHO and WASHO oppose cutbacks in the apportionments from the Trust Fund. We have experienced two of these adjustments in just two years. Some of these effects have been very traumatic.

Again, let me quote from my statement to the Roads Subcommittee as it pertains to the cutback:

"The so-called 'cutbacks' of 1966, and the present one, have added to this uncertainty.

"It takes at least four years to develop a project before it can go to contract. During that time, a great deal of planning and engineering work must take place and commitments must be made to the affected parties and agencies.

"The highway program is so big, and a State highway department is such a complex organization, that letting dates and the projects involved in those lettings must be scheduled months in advance. The uncertainty and the off-balance features that we have mentioned can cause many problems in necessary rescheduling caused by slowdowns in the program that are not in conformity to Congressional authorizations.

"Please understand that the State highway departments are not taking the position that the highway program should be placed above the National interest, or that it should be subject to no control whatsoever, but we are of the opinion that the authorizations established by the Congress, and the ability of the Trust Fund to support the program, should be the controlling features in the way that the program is advanced and carried out.

"It is our experience that a cutback in the highway program in most or all of the States has such an adverse impact on the local economy, and on the contracting industry, that it makes the overall beneficial effects of such cutbacks questionable, especially when one views the magnitude of our vast and growing highway needs that are getting ahead of our efforts.

"We feel that any time that the National interest should dictate a reduction in the highway program, that it should be carefully thought out and should probably be accomplished by a reduction in Congressional authorizations, and made known in sufficient time that all those affected by it can adjust without experiencing a psychological shock."

To reiterate briefly, the successful future of any "After '75" program depends primarily on several factors. These factors include: a definite program for the continuation of federal apportionments to both "bridge" and "subsidy" states; no further additions to the Interstate program; upgrading Primary and urban highway programs; the continuation of the Highway Trust Fund; and finally, that no further cutbacks be imposed on the apportionment of federal funds from the Highway User Trust Fund.

On these points, then, I respectfully solicit your earnest and active support to insure a continuing program of highway construction and maintenance on a nationwide basis.

I feel these factors are vital if our highway system is to continue to meet the demands placed on it by the highway users.

Thank you for the opportunity of visiting with you today, and I trust that I have given you an idea of the thinking of WASHO and AASHO on the continuation of an adequate highway program.

Thank you.

SOMETHING OF VALUE

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee is a detailed blueprint for an all-out attack on the decaying center cities and substandard housing that is the shame of this country.

In a number of innovative and creative new programs and through expanded use of existing programs this legislation will go far toward revising our cities and providing decent homes for all Americans. There is no more important piece of legislation we will consider this year. It has the support of organized labor, of the mortgage banking community, of all segments of the American public.

I was pleased to see that the Christian Science Monitor, a most respected and influential newspaper, has also added its endorsement of the bill. I hope that all of my colleagues will take a moment to read the following editorial from the Monitor and will keep it in mind as we consider this vital legislation.

The editorial follows:

OMNIBUS BILL

The \$5.2 billion housing bill passed by the Senate has many significant provisions. But the most timely are those which reach out to help lower income families acquire decent shelter.

The most innovative provision—though at \$300 million not the most heavily funded—would extend home ownership to 500,000 families with incomes of \$3,500 to \$6,800 through mortgage-interest subsidies. The family would have to pay up to 20 percent of its income toward the housing payment, and the government would help with all but 1 percent of the mortgage-interest cost. At present, with interest rates running from 6 to 7 percent, and most of the interest loaded on the front end of the payment period, the government's share could come to a third of the monthly housing cost—a substantial help.

The mortgage-interest feature proved helpful in gaining bipartisan support for the bill, which is viewed as a first three-year step in President Johnson's massive 10-year six-million unit housing program outlined earlier this year. The feature is derived from home-ownership plans first advanced by Senators Percy (R) of Illinois and Mondale (D) of Minnesota.

For the rent subsidy provision, \$300 million would be made available for the construction and rehabilitation of 700,000 rental units. Another \$140 million would be used for helping with monthly rent payments, the family paying up to 25 percent and the government the rest.

Another encouraging feature of the bill is the door it opens for the private sector to share in regeneration of our nation's housing. A national housing corporation would be

established, funded by private investors, to seek local builder-investment teams for local efforts.

To these provisions have been added others to extend insurance and mortgage-guarantee powers into the ghettos, protect land buyers from unscrupulous developers, and make grants to cities for small neighborhood development plans and existing model-city projects.

In all, the comprehensive bill marks an important step in revivifying the hopes of many Americans for a secure household.

THE McDADE AMENDMENT TO THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, earlier in the year, both Houses of Congress passed a bill, which became known as the Truth-in-Lending Act, to bring the matter of interest charges under the watchful eye of the Federal Government.

However significant that bill might have been in its original form, it was made doubly significant by the addition of a whole section when it was considered by the other body of Congress. This was an amendment to bring the malevolent racket of loansharking within the criminal statutes of the Department of Justice.

The author of that amendment was my distinguished colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Scranton [Mr. McDade].

I am delighted to invite the attention of Senators to an article written by Jerome S. Cahill and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 17, 1968, narrating the story of that most significant portion of the truth-in-lending law. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AREA LAWMAKER, PROFESSOR SPUR FEDERAL WAR ON LOAN SHARKS
(By Jerome S. Cahill)

WASHINGTON.—Congress has given the Federal Government sweeping new power to combat loan shark racketeers in two recently enacted bills aimed at cutting off that multimillion-dollar source of revenue for organized crime.

One of the measures is the omnibus crime control measure now awaiting President Johnson's signature. It empowers police to use wiretapping and electronic surveillance techniques in loan shark investigations.

The other is the "truth in lending" bill that Mr. Johnson signed into law May 29. A section of that bill makes extortionate extension of credit a Federal crime subject to a \$10,000 fine or 20-year prison sentence.

One of the prime movers in the effort to incorporate the anti-loan shark language into the lending bill was Rep. Joseph M. McDade (R., Scranton). A member of the Wednesday Club, a group of liberal and moderate GOP House members, McDade headed a study team that reported last summer that loan sharks were preying on the Nation's poor to the extent of \$350 million a year.

With the help of Henry S. Ruth, Jr., assistant professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania, and others, McDade set out to do something about it, Ruth helped the

Scranton Congressman draft a bill that was introduced in the House Jan. 16, and provided the framework that House-Senate conferees used in the law that was finally approved.

Taken in conjunction with the new wiretapping and bugging authority, Ruth believes the new law will be an effective tool for law enforcement officers. He is particularly pleased that the conferees refused to accept the approach to the problem proposed by Rep. Richard Poff (R., Va.), who would have restricted Federal agents to those cases where interstate commerce was involved.

Poff, a conservative, feared that extending Federal prohibitions against purely local loan shark activities would be a step toward a national police force. Against this speculative concern, Congress had to weigh the practical problem that the most insidious of the loan shark activities were small transactions where the interstate connection often was tenuous.

In the end, the conferees followed the McDade lead, finding organized crime engaged in usurious and extortionate loans in "intrastate commerce," as well as interstate commerce. They went a step further, asserting that such transactions directly impair the effectiveness and frustrate the purposes of Federal bankruptcy laws.

Ruth, who studied the racket in the course of his service as deputy director of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, also is pleased that McDade's proposal to grant witnesses immunity was preserved in the final enactment.

He pointed out that successful prosecutions often have been hampered by the refusal of witnesses to testify on grounds that they might themselves be subject to prosecution. The immunity statute should correct this problem, he said.

SANTA FE MARKS ITS CENTENNIAL YEAR

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, this is the year the great Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railroad Co. is observing its 100th birthday. In the parlance of the industry, it is passing milepost 100. Since this enterprise, now known far and wide as the Santa Fe, was conceived and developed in the Second District of Kansas, and since Kansas and the Santa Fe grew up together, I feel obliged to call attention to the 100-year-old history of this line and the fascinating story of how it started and expanded beyond the borders of Kansas, east and west, to become a recognized leader in railroading.

From the pages of its centennial publication, "Milepost 100," I offer this capsule summary of Santa Fe history, and in doing so, salute the men of yesterday and today who have contributed to this brilliant chapter in America's growth and progress:

HOW IT STARTED OLD SANTA FE TRAIL

At one end there was Independence, Missouri. At the other rested Santa Fe, an exotic city nestling in the remoteness of the "Great American Desert." Between the two lay some 800 miles of faintly marked trail, snaking its way across the plains and through the mountains. This barely visible thoroughfare was destined to become a major artery of commerce.

Before Mexico received its independence from Spain, traders from United States outposts to the east were met with a notable lack of enthusiasm upon arrival at Santa Fe. The ruling Spaniards discouraged such trade by the simple expedient of jailing unsuspecting traders and confiscating their merchandise.

The first successful attempt to carry on overland trade with Santa Fe was a small expedition from Missouri organized and led by Captain William Becknell in 1821, shortly after Mexico gained its freedom. So successful was Becknell's first trip, that a larger expedition was formed the next year and a new and shorter route to Santa Fe was pioneered and mapped.

Both routes departed southwesterly from Council Grove, Kansas, and intersected the Arkansas River near Great Bend, following the river to a point just east of Dodge City. Here the trails diverged, one branch heading generally south and west across the plains to Las Vegas, and the other, more generally used, followed the Arkansas River to La Junta and turned south over the Raton Mountains to Las Vegas. Both of these routes are roughly the same as those followed by the Santa Fe Railroad of today. After Becknell's second caravan, commerce over the Santa Fe Trail expanded by leaps and bounds.

Thus, from its very beginning the trail was a two-way road of trade—a highway traversed by strings of laden pack mules. This limited form of transport was soon replaced by lengthy wagon trains inching westward with bulging loads of various trade goods from the more heavily settled East. On the return trip, the wagon wheels squealed under their huge cargoes of furs and precious metals from the Mexican mines.

As trade expanded and navigation of the Missouri River extended westward, so too, the outfitting points for the caravans moved further west to Kansas City and Independence. Normal practice was for the adventurous trader to load his provisions and trade goods and strike out alone for Council Grove, a rendezvous point on the route to Santa Fe. At that point, for reasons of safety, the wagon trains were formed and generally reached the profitable marketplace at Santa Fe in eighty or ninety days.

It was in full recognition of this ever-increasing commerce that the soon-to-be railroad builders, mindful of the tremendous traffic potential, cast longing glances in the direction of Santa Fe.

THE DREAM

Cyrus K. Holliday was the father of the Santa Fe Railroad. He was a dreamer but also a doer—possessed of an engaging personality, imagination, resourcefulness and unlimited perseverance. Without all of these qualities, the tasks he set himself to would have been beyond accomplishment.

Holliday arrived on the Kansas scene during the fall of 1854 with two objectives in mind. He wanted to found a town in the new territory. However, even more important, was his determination to build a railroad capable of transporting the vast amount of goods moving to and from the trappers and traders at Santa Fe—the trade center of the vast Southwest.

During his first few years in Kansas, he devoted all of his boundless energies to the establishment and promotion of the city of Topeka. He was largely responsible for its having been named the state capital in 1859. Having successfully accomplished the first of his two objectives, he became obsessed with the second of his dreams—building a railroad over the old Santa Fe Trail from the Missouri River to Santa Fe.

The charter for the Atchison and Topeka Railroad—the base from which the present system grew—was prepared single-handedly by Holliday in 1859. As a member of the Territorial Legislature, Holliday introduced the charter on February 1, 1859. With the

"skids greased" by his foresight and advance groundwork, the bill sailed through both the House and Senate and was approved by the Governor on February 11.

The Civil War and the disarranged business conditions of the country made the raising of investment capital a lengthy and heartbreaking task, a struggle that endured for ten years, but the perseverance of Holliday and his Kansas friends eventually triumphed.

It was October 30, 1868, that saw the real beginning of the railroad—the turning of the first spade of earth at Topeka. Holliday took this occasion to forecast again that the line would eventually extend to the city of Santa Fe. Carried away by his own enthusiasm and the festive note of the occasion, he confidently predicted the road would, in time, reach the Pacific Coast and as an afterthought he added the Gulf of Mexico. Those present who did not laugh outright smiled tolerantly at what they felt were the ravings of a "lunatic."

ACROSS KANSAS

The new railroad headed neither for Atchison nor Santa Fe but east toward the nearby Kaw River. Before the road could be built, it must bridge the river and establish a connection with Kansas Pacific. Once this task had been accomplished, the road built nearly south to Burlingame and its excellent coal deposits which furnished both traffic and fuel for the infant line.

Santa Fe's first train—the Wakarusa Picnic Special—rolled out of Topeka on April 26, 1869, carrying dignitaries and company officials. Tracks had been laid for only seven miles to Pauline and the remaining five miles to Wakarusa were covered by buggies and wagons. The picnic celebration, as was the custom of the day, consisted of eating, drinking, general merrymaking and very extensive oratory.

The line covered the twenty-six miles to Burlingame and, in spite of financial difficulties, had pushed ahead to Emporia by July, 1870. Not only did the rails reach Florence during 1871 but were extended to Newton, a trail town of cattle, gunplay, sin and eventual respectability.

Most of the towns west of Emporia did not exist prior to the coming of the railroad but were laid out and named by the Company. The only inhabitants were roving bands of marauding Indians and tremendous herds of buffalo. To reach the Kansas-Colorado border by March 3, 1873, as specified in the charter, the Santa Fe built about 360 miles of road in less than nine months, including the long-awaited Topeka to Atchison link. Kansas had been crossed and the line to Granada, Colorado, was opened for traffic May 10, 1873.

THE SODBUSTERS

The Santa Fe stretched from Topeka to the Colorado state line but there were very few people along the line and little freight to be carried in 1873. The young road needed traffic but without settlers there could be little business.

Agents were appointed in the new towns, the East and even in Europe, to push the sale of lands. Tons of literature were distributed. Land-seekers were given special rates, usually half-fare, and the price of the ticket could be applied to the purchase price of the land.

Santa Fe seemed near disaster when the grasshoppers came to Kansas. Crops were devoured and starving settlers were returning to the East in 1874. It was that year that the great influx of Mennonites from Russia began. They arrived in Topeka amid jeers at their strange ways and dress, the jeers soon became cheers when it was discovered they were well-financed. Undaunted by blizzards, droughts or grasshoppers, they purchased the equipment of the returning settlers and set about preparing their lands and building houses. Their most important contribution was popularizing the growing and mill-

ing of the hard red Turkey wheat they had brought from Russia. This meant millions of dollars to the grain country and to Santa Fe over the years.

The Santa Fe cut its rates, land prices, and hauled building material free for a year. It even chartered liners to bring the settlers from Europe and they came—from Germany, Sweden, Russia and Italy. The cattle towns and ranchers did not appreciate the fences strung by these hard-working farmers but the fences stayed and the farmers were tremendously successful with the land.

During the drought years of 1874-75, Santa Fe hauled enormous tonnages free to save its settlers. It hauled thousands of bushels of seed grain free to farmers. The railroad's efforts to save its settlers paid off; colonies of successful farmers were established. These colonies later built up a heavy freight business for the road. It was these once-despised "sodbusters" who transformed the prairies into farms and orchards.

CONSTRUCTION INTO COLORADO

There was ample inducement for extending the line westward into Colorado. Large coal deposits around Canon City and Trinidad promised large eastbound tonnage. Colorado timber would provide settlers in Kansas with direly needed lumber. The mining industry with its proven reserves of precious metals would develop rapidly with improved transportation. This held forth the lure of heavy traffic in eastbound ores and equally important, would create an increasing demand for mining machinery and manufactured goods from cities east of the Missouri River.

Santa Fe's gateway to the interior of Colorado was the city of Pueblo, where a connection would be made with an existing road to Denver. A line through Trinidad would approach the New Mexico boundary where much of the overland wagon traffic could be attracted to the railroad. Colorado offered virtually limitless traffic and it was decided to build to Pueblo, 138 miles west of Granada.

The first fifty miles to Las Animas were completed and ready for operation on September 13, 1875. On March 1, 1876 the line to Pueblo was placed in regular service.

SOUTH AND WEST PAST SANTA FE

In 1877, the Santa Fe surveyed a route between Trinidad, Colorado, and the country south of the Raton Mountains via Raton Pass. One road was already operating in the Trinidad area and was thought to be ready to appropriate the Pass for its own use. A race for the Pass resulted. In those days, possession was nine-tenths of the law and Santa Fe's grading crews reached the Pass only minutes ahead of those of the competitor. Had this not been the case, Santa Fe might have literally been "headed off at the pass."

Las Vegas was reached in July, 1879. The main line had pushed through Goriotta Pass and dropped down to Lamy in the Rio Grande Valley. By this time the ultimate destination was the Pacific Coast and the main line was to follow the Rio Grande to Albuquerque.

It was a grave disappointment to learn that the roads' main line could not be routed through the long-sought city of Santa Fe, but surveys indicated there was no practical way to build west out of town. The citizenry of Santa Fe was determined to have rail service and approved a bond issue to aid in constructing a branch line from Lamy. Thus, the first Santa Fe train to the namesake city arrived February 16, 1880. Holliday's dream had been realized. Perhaps the other early objectives—the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico and Chicago—were not ridiculous after all.

Albuquerque was reached on April 15, 1880 and six months later tracks were laid as far south as San Marcial without any sign of stopping. A connection at Deming with another road building east from California on March 8, 1881 gave the nation its second transcontinental line.

EXPANSION EAST

Expansion of the Santa Fe both east and west was begun in 1875. Kansas City had become the terminus of practically all the important railroads in the area and was rapidly emerging as the greatest cattle and grain market of the Southwest. In view of the fact that grain and cattle comprised the bulk of Santa Fe's eastbound traffic and lay a mere 67 miles east of Topeka, it became essential to secure directly served terminal facilities at Kansas City.

Reaching this growing metropolis would provide ready markets for grain and livestock thereby stimulating growth of this eastbound traffic. Too, Santa Fe stood to gain considerable westbound traffic, both freight and passenger. Access to this potential traffic was gained on October 1, 1875, when the company leased the Kansas City, Topeka and Western, an existing road between Kansas City and Topeka.

SEEKING PACIFIC PORTS

"Santa Fe officials felt all of the freight traffic to Arizona and much destined for Southern California would naturally move over the new and shorter transcontinental route. The connecting line, which was already handling this traffic from San Francisco, saw no reason to share its revenues with this invader from the East. They felt it would be better to have the goods move to San Francisco over the Central Pacific-Union Pacific route and then south and east on their road. To this end, they flatly refused to establish rates which would enable goods to move over the new route. Santa Fe was at the mercy of its competition.

Another Santa Fe attempt to reach the ports of San Francisco and San Diego met the same fate. In a joint venture, Santa Fe and a cooperative mid-western railroad purchased the struggling Atlantic and Pacific railroad. Under the name and charter of the Atlantic and Pacific, a new line was built west from Albuquerque through Arizona. Recognizing the threat posed by this line and still desirous of maintaining their stranglehold, the competition gained control of the cooperating midwestern road. No action could be taken without consent of both roads which meant that the tracks of the Atlantic and Pacific were stopped at Needles, California. The competition did build a line north from Mojave to Needles, California, the end of Atlantic and Pacific construction, ostensibly giving Santa Fe access to the Pacific Coast.

Once again the situation proved intolerable and Santa Fe made arrangements for obtaining or building parallel or shorter routes. Either alternative would have rendered the newly-built Mojave to Needles line worthless and it was sold to Atlantic and Pacific at cost in 1884. At the same time, an agreement providing for joint trackage to San Francisco was negotiated. Having finally reached the major Coast ports and no longer dependent on the good will of its competitor, Santa Fe expanded its California trackage through mergers and purchases of smaller lines.

NEXT, THE GULF OF MEXICO

By the time the battle for access to the Pacific subsided in 1884, the Santa Fe's network of branch lines throughout Kansas had been considerably strengthened and expanded.

That same year, with eyes on the Gulf of Mexico, Santa Fe received Congressional authority to build south from Arkansas City, Kansas, through Indian Territory. The Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe, a Galveston based road, had also obtained rights to build north across the Territory. The G.C. & S.F. ran into financial difficulties and a contract for its sale to Santa Fe was negotiated with the provision that it would build north from Fort Worth, Texas, and connect with the line Santa Fe was building from Arkansas City. The rails were bolted together at Purcell on April 26, 1887, with the discovery of tre-

mendous oil reserves and the great land rushes to settle what is now Oklahoma still in the future.

The Congressional permission to build across the Territory south also provided for construction of a railroad from Kiowa, Kansas, through Wynoka to the south and west. On September 12, 1887, rails were laid across the Texas state line and the road continued to Panhandle City and later Amarillo. This road eventually became part of the Santa Fe's present mainline through the Texas Panhandle.

THE RAILROAD MECCA—CHICAGO

It was evident by 1883 that Santa Fe should build to Chicago which was even then well on its way to becoming the "railroad center of the world." The engineer for the project drew a straight line between Kansas City and Chicago as the desired route. Locators were warned not to plan any curve they could not account for. It was eventually decided to purchase and rebuild the Chicago & St. Louis and use about 100 miles of it as the new line.

After a highly secretive location survey and right-of-way acquisition campaign, which began in 1885 and lasted until December, 1886, the Santa Fe established construction offices in Kansas City and Chicago and started building between those points in March, 1887. Since the surveyed line intersected 13 other roads, the operation was greatly simplified. Construction of the segment still stands as an outstanding achievement in railroading. In nine months, some 350 miles of new line were built, about 100 were completely rebuilt, and five large bridges were erected across major rivers.

Terminal facilities in Chicago were acquired by purchase or lease of various short lines which, when pieced together provided an excellent route to the leased Dearborn Station. This "airline" even today gives the Santa Fe the shortest and fastest route between the two major cities. In January, 1888, train service was begun and regular operations commenced on May 1.

From the turning of the first spade of Kansas earth on October 30, 1868, the little railroad had within a span of twenty years become one of the greatest systems of the world—a railroad that extended from Lake Michigan to the Pacific Coast and to the Gulf of Mexico.

The dream of Cyrus K. Holliday had been fulfilled.

END OR BEGINNING

Conception and realization of the dream was accomplished largely through the leadership, energy and devotion of C. K. Holliday and W. B. Strong. Magnificent though it was, the dream served only as the base for the growth of the Santa Fe, the beginning as it were. The Santa Fe, with its subsidiary operations and a modern railroad plant second to none, was built step by step under the guidance of many men—men of great vision.

Each of these men has made his contribution and left his imprint etched on the pages of its corporate history. The second century of progress will undoubtedly see other names added to the list as having made equally great contributions.

DEATH OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the tragic death of Senator Robert F. Kennedy has moved Americans across the entire

CXIV—1196—Part 14

Nation to expressions of their deep-felt sorrow—sorrow for the Kennedy family, which has endured so much; sorrow for the Nation, which has lost an able young leader; and sorrow for themselves—for every American has lost the helping hand of a man who cared deeply about individuals and their needs. Two of my constituents have expressed their grief in beautifully moving poems. So that all Members of Congress may share with me the message of these poems, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD. The first is by Mr. Harold F. Mohn of Myerstown, Pa.; the second is by Mrs. Marion G. Mosely of Germantown, Pa.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRAYER FOR THE REPOSE OF THE BELOVED SENATOR, ROBERT F. KENNEDY

(By Harold F. Mohn, Freedoms Foundation George Washington Medal of Honor recipient)

Almighty God, into Your arms

We ask You to take this son,
Whose work in life and on this earth
Is at an end and done.

Accept him to Your kingdom, God,
And bid him enter in,
Where he may find eternal peace
Free from all strife and sin.

Dear God, 'twas You who gave his breath
To see the light of day;
Accept him now into Your arms,
There let him ever stay.

REFORMATION OF THE COVENANT (By Marion G. Mosely)

Though we are falling—

You need not
Bear the guilt
Nor I the shame
In sad aloneness
Rejecting the covenant,
Confused in our pain
And torn with its happening,
Suffering our silences
In grim awareness
Absorbed by the moment's
Real or seeming slight,
And recolling with
Each threatening thrust
Of violence
To whet and sharpen
Tired cruel defenses,
So bound by our torment
Of the stricken self
The corrupted soul,
We no longer recall
It is only through
The covenant.

We are sustained—

And all life asks is
That we yield to accept
That we try to express
As we can
The way you are
The way I am,
Forgiving the trespass
While embracing the truth,
As truth unfolds
The gifts
Withdrawn out of
The hallowed place
Of our integrity,
Shaping them to describe
Our separate need
Our mutual yearning
As it occurs
With the rise to
Realize harmony or
With this frightening
Curve of our fall
To revive.

In the pause for exchange—

As we are
Like descending stars
Trailing fires of change
Into the waiting arms
Of deep renewal,
Drawn by our struggle
To sustain awareness
Unto the sheltering sea
Of our dim knowing,
Our pause for peace,
There surrounded by
The myriad rhythms
Of time
The soul responds
In kind to
The sacred stimulus,
Submitting to love's
Strange and subtle
Persuasions coaxing us
Into the joyous urge
To thrust free
Reborn.

To live again—

Released to rise
Through love
By the grace of forgiveness
By our simple acceptance
Of truth's unfolding awareness
To create new forms
An offering of our joy
In remembrance of
This place we are
Blessed to share
In the way
That is yours
In the way
That is mine
Through the life
That is ours.

(NOTE.—This poem is dedicated to the memory of Medgar Evers, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy for they have loved, they have served their God and their country with all they had to offer.)

FACTS VERSUS EMOTIONS IN HUNGER

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of programs to ease the difficulties confronting some of our people around the country, we must be careful to assure that we are acting on facts and not merely being swayed by emotional arguments which may be presented. This point is brought very clearly in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 25, and I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

FACTS VERSUS EMOTIONS IN HUNGER

One of the television networks produced a program purporting to document hunger in America, and apparently was so pleased with its efforts that the show was broadcast twice.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, however, was not pleased. He provided some documentation of his own to support his charge that the show was a "distorted, oversimplified, and misleading picture of domestic hunger and what is being done to combat it." One example will suffice to illustrate the secretary's complaint.

The network presented a man and wife with 10 children living on the husband's part-time employment—"earning \$3 to \$4 a day when he worked." Despite this low income, according to the TV presentation, the family was required to pay \$70 a month for food stamps, and "with this unrealistic pur-

chase requirement, the family could not take advantage of the stamps."

The facts, according to Freeman, are that when certified for the food stamp program the family consisted of husband, wife, grandmother, and 10 children. The family's income was \$180 a month from farming, part-time work, and a combined welfare grant and pension of \$82 a month for the grandmother. Based on this income, the purchase requirement was \$70 worth of stamps a month, which bought \$128 worth of food.

Later when the husband was not working and the family income was reduced, the stamp purchase requirement was lowered to \$18, which bought \$108 worth of food. Instead of being unable to utilize the stamp program, the family has in fact purchased stamps regularly since last September, receiving \$783 worth of food for an investment of \$246, or three times as much food as it would have been able to buy without the program.

Regardless of how well intentioned, this is another example of some of the hokum the public is getting about the hunger problem. A few weeks ago a private citizens' group issued a report claiming concrete evidence of widespread hunger and malnutrition and implying that millions of Americans were at the point of starvation. The other day the House agriculture committee refuted it with a report indicating that while there is widespread malnutrition because of ignorance and local custom, there is very little hunger resulting from inability to buy food or get it under public assistance.

There is, of course, no need for widespread malnutrition in a country which produces more than enough food for everyone. The problem is more likely to be remedied by careful consideration of facts, rather than thru careless appeals to emotions.

CONGRESSMAN GILBERT'S STAND ON 10-PERCENT SURTAX

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was after much deliberation that I decided to vote against the proposal to increase the tax surcharge by 10 percent. I am not unaware of the precarious state of the American economy. I cast my vote in full consciousness of the difficulties faced by the budget and by the dollar. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I acknowledge a particular responsibility to maintaining our economy in a sound state. But, in the final analysis, I had to conclude that I would not be true to my constituents or to the Nation if I voted in favor of this measure.

I could not, in good conscience, vote for a bill that requires a \$6 billion reduction in expenditures, without specifying from what facet of the budget these reductions would come. It is my experience that budget cuts of this nature invariably come in those segments of the budget that do not have powerful interests to protect them. A hue and cry has already been raised against cutting the defense budget. Rich and powerful lobbying organizations will be presenting themselves to protect the appropriations of the great corporations. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that the cuts will inevitably be made against the interests of those who can protect themselves least. I speak, of course, of the poor. There is no doubt in my mind that this is, in fact, the inten-

tion of some of my colleagues. But I, for one, will not lend myself to any plan which will cut the already meager services that the poor of this Nation receive. Now is the time to fight poverty harder than ever. I fear that this bill will, in its reality, signal the abandonment of that fight.

If the majority of this Congress were really anxious to raise more revenue, Mr. Speaker, there were other ways to go about it. I speak of the many loopholes in our taxing system that might have been closed. Everyone in this body knows that the Government loses billions every year through these loopholes. Whom do they benefit? The rich, of course. They make the rich richer. I say that, in this day, we must correct the injustices of our taxing system by closing the loopholes through which the rich escape. This money is not merely lost. It must be made up by others. It is, of course, made up by the salaried people of our society, those who have few opportunities to sneak their incomes through tax loopholes. I object to that method of tax collection and I cannot sanction its increase with my vote. By imposing a surtax of 10 percent, we simply enlarge the inequity by 10 percent. We do not come to grips with the essential injustices of our system. On the contrary, we perpetuate them. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every American—rich as well as nonrich—must share the burden of our current financial crisis. I will not vote for a plan that distributes the responsibilities so unequally.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE: JOHN W. MACY, JR.

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on Employment of the Handicapped has named John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, as a recipient of one of its distinguished service awards. Chairman Macy's selection is an especially well deserved one; for, since his installation as executive director of the Civil Service Commission in 1953, and through his appointment as chairman in 1961, he has helped raise the number of handicapped persons in Federal jobs from a few hundred to over 17,000 at this date.

This is indeed a remarkable achievement, demonstrating as it does, the Federal Government's responsibility to be the ideal employer. Handicapped persons certainly have much to offer the employer as they have proven time and time again to be generally tireless and able workers. Chairman Macy has, throughout his public career, distinguished himself as a dedicated and excellent judge of personnel requirements, and the quality of Federal service is that much the better for his steady, responsible leadership.

John W. Macy's history can serve as an inspiring example to young people contemplating Federal service. Upon gradu-

ating Phi Beta Kappa from Wesleyan University in 1938, he enrolled as a participant in the administrative intern program under the auspices of the National Institute for Public Affairs; and, excepting 3 years of service in the Army, Macy served continuously in various departments of the U.S. Government. In August 1953, he was appointed executive director of the U.S. Civil Service Commission—that Agency's top career post. In 1958, he left Federal Service to serve his alma mater, Wesleyan University, as executive vice president before being appointed Chairman of the CSC by President Kennedy in 1961.

It is an axiom that our Government is only so good as the men who serve it. The Civil Service Commission, under John W. Macy's able leadership, has been guided by this belief; for this, all Americans can be grateful.

A FORMER NRA EDITOR WRITES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a recent article which appeared in the Washington Post:

A FORMER NRA EDITOR WRITES

(By James B. Stenson)

Within the past week, the leaders of the National Rifle Association have sent a notice to every one of the organization's nearly 1 million members, warning that "the right of sportsmen in the United States to obtain, own and use firearms for proper lawful purposes is in the greatest jeopardy in the history of our country." The notice calls for "immediate action." That immediate action has resulted, or will result soon in an avalanche of emotional and vindictive mail to members of Congress demanding defeat of the Administration's proposed gun controls (S. 3604, S. 3605, H.R. 17735).

As a former associate editor with *The American Rifleman*, the NRA's official journal, I testify that the leadership of the NRA does not speak for more than a fraction of the gun owners in this country. The overwhelming majority of hunters, sportsmen, and shooters support effective gun controls at all levels of government.

During my tenure with *The Rifleman*, I came to know the NRA's official position—and the facts and statistics on which it is based—as well as any other member of the Association or any of the Association's many critics. Let me testify that thousands of NRA members have been influenced by a campaign of emotionalism, innuendo, and distortion of fact. For example, the NRA leadership has asserted that less than 4 percent of all crime involves firearms. This figure is computed by grouping the several score thousand "personal crimes" (homicide, aggravated assault, armed robbery, etc.) together with nearly a million "property crimes" (larceny over \$50, auto theft, burglary, etc.). The former group nearly always involves a weapon; the second does not.

It has been further asserted that figures concerning criminal abuse of rifles and shotguns have been exaggerated; that, in fact, "only 7 per cent of murders last year were committed with rifles and only 9 per cent with shotguns" (*Rifleman* editorial, Oct. 1967). This is true, and it is quoted correctly from the FBI's *Uniform Crime Reports*. However, that sum of 16 percent represents

the tragic and senseless loss of nearly 900 people's lives.

NRA members have been told that the Administration's proposed legislation would mean "serious inconvenience" to individuals in remote areas because they could not receive firearms in interstate commerce. What they have not been told is that under the Dodd-Celler proposals, any law-abiding citizen could order a firearm from another state through his local gun dealer. The ordinary citizen would not be hindered by this situation but the criminal or youngster would be. (There are documented cases of junior high school students receiving rifles by mail order without their parents' knowledge.)

The point I am trying to make is that the members of our Congress are up against a sheer act of collective will, and nothing more. Any right has its commensurate responsibilities. But the right to bear arms, guaranteed in the Constitution, will remain a shapeless abstraction if this Congress does not set its limits this year with reasonable and enforceable legislation.

If NRA members choose to accept uncritically what is told to them about this proposed legislation, that is their concern. But if they presume—or are presumed—to speak for the majority of gun owners in this country, then it is everyone's concern to speak up forcefully and set matters straight. Of the more than 18,000 pieces of legislation submitted to this Congress, only a handful deal with matters of life or death. It is urgent that effective firearms laws be passed this session without further delay.

REMARKS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR. AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA COMMENCEMENT

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker—

Somehow, in the myriad cries of minorities competing for attention, it seems to have been forgotten that a democracy, the majority rules, that a free society rests on the consent of the many, not on the dissent of the few.

These were the words of our able Governor of Virginia, Mills E. Godwin, Jr., on the 9th of June of this year when he delivered the commencement address to the graduating class at the University of Virginia. The Governor of Virginia will go down in history as one of Virginia's finest. His forthright commencement address at Charlottesville, Va., is interesting and timely. I include his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS BY GOV. MILLS E. GODWIN, JR., UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA COMMENCEMENT, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., JUNE 9, 1968

As Governor of the Commonwealth, I am eternally proud that this University continues to grow in stature, and to be in every sense, the University of Virginia.

The pleasure I have today is to perform one of the traditional rites of Spring, to make your commencement address. Tradition would dictate my reminding you that you will shortly go out into the world, but this seems strangely out of tune with the times. The miracle of electronics brings the entire world to your very doorstep every evening, and every hour, on the hour, throughout the day.

It would be more accurate to say that henceforth you will have to take some of

the responsibility for the state of the world, instead of merely complaining about it as undergraduates are wont to do.

If I were to follow still another commencement tradition, I would tell you that you are among the privileged few who have a college education, and that therefore you are ordained to be leaders in that world.

But again, the facts of life indicate otherwise. Across the nation, more than half of all Americans of college age were actually in college this semester.

Before you have made your mark in the world, you will be among the majority of your age group who hold baccalaureate degrees, not among the minority.

I suggest to you that this is far more than a statistical concept. It is the minorities today who make the headlines and the telecasts. It is the minorities who are caught up in what they consider the crusade for a better world. It is the minorities who ask for, and who too often are accorded, the special considerations for which they march or for which they riot.

It is much less glamorous to be among the majority. The majority goes to work and pays its taxes and educates its own children. It joins the civic clubs and the PTA's and is satisfied to make progress in an orderly fashion, one step at a time.

And if some of the majority's members exercise unusual talent and energy and perseverance, they are often rewarded by being castigated as members of the Establishment.

Somehow, in the myriad cries of minorities competing for attention, it seems to have been forgotten that in a democracy, the majority rules, that a free society rests on the consent of the many, not on the dissent of the few.

And so I would not offer you advice today on what you should do in order to assure your success in life. Rather I would describe for you what you must not do, and what you must not allow to be done as members of the majority, if you are to preserve a successful American society.

If this is a negative approach, then I think it is time for a resounding negative to be voiced. I suggest that you revive the lost art of saying "no," and of making it stick.

For at least a half-dozen intense years, our national leaders have urged us to perfect the Great American Dream, not only for our own citizens, but for most of the world.

The response was not long in coming. Various minorities of our own laid swift and often violent claim that they were the ones who did not share the realization of that dream.

Shocked and dismayed, many of our leaders and many of our people tried first to meet the demands made upon them, only to be confronted with still larger demands.

The whirlwind had been let loose, and the result was confusion bordering on chaos. We are currently treated to the sorry spectacle of a plywood tent city on public property, in the shadow of the Washington Monument.

It is cruel to mislead the less fortunate, and dangerous as well, but it is even more dangerous to overlook, or to ignore, the very fundamentals of self-government.

By their lofty promises, by their shocked silence, by their lack of resolution when the reaction came, many of our national leaders have done both.

I suggest to you, who will shortly become full-fledged citizens, that it is time to draw some lines. It is time to say, "this far, and no farther."

We cannot encourage men and women to believe that utopia is just around the corner without running the risk of having them turn on us when they find it is not so.

We cannot operate a society on the theory that whenever a minority wants something, it starts a riot, or occupies public property, or throws a college president out of his office.

If we reward one set of rioters, three more

will spring up in their place. If we make concessions to one encampment, we will have to make concessions to many encampments. We cannot buy security from violence.

We cannot maintain law and order by permitting its open defiance. The first equality before the law is that every man abides by the law. Otherwise, no man is safe from the lawlessness of his neighbor.

We cannot for long guarantee every jobless man an income by taxing men who work for a living, and have no such guarantee.

We cannot give a job to a man who is not qualified without denying a job to a man who is qualified.

We cannot stimulate incentive with public handouts.

We cannot guarantee mutual respect between men by any statute or any court decree. We cannot legislate away what is in men's hearts and in their minds.

We cannot extend freedom by infringing on the rights of others.

And surely the wreckage of the civilizations that have preceded our own should convince us that we cannot feed every public clamor out of the public purse.

Once we understand these things we cannot do, it will be easier to do what we can do, and what we must do.

We can extend the vast potential of opportunity to many who do not now enjoy its benefits to the fullest.

We can help the less fortunate among us to help themselves.

We can prepare the jobless for worthwhile employment.

As the surest road to self-respect, to personal identity, to equality of citizenship, we can provide education to anyone and everyone who can benefit from the experience.

We can provide this education, not as the inalienable right of every citizen, but as a privilege extended to him at public expense because he is expected to use his learning for the public good.

And this above all: we can do these things within the fundamental framework of a system which has produced the most freedom in its society, the most abundance in its economy, and the most responsive government the world has ever seen.

There is still time. Certainly in Virginia, there is still time.

Some of that time will be used up in trying to untangle this country's dilemma, in understanding the forces at work, in separating obtainable goals from unrealistic demands, in deciding between sensible stands and untenable positions, between necessary adjustments and dangerous tinkering within the machinery of government.

This will largely be the task of my generation. I caution you to watch us closely, not just to approve or disapprove of what we do, but to search always for an understanding of why it was done, and of the circumstances that surrounded the decision.

For most of you will be among the majority that patiently bears the burden of self-government, that watches the militants jockeying for publicity and the ambitious contesting for power, and that in the end, finally and irrevocably, makes the decision.

I have told you there is still time—time to prepare yourselves.

Use that time wisely, and use it well.

MINNEAPOLIS STAR'S WORLD
AFFAIRS CONTEST

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week the Minneapolis Star flew six young men

to Washington to tour the Nation's Capital and meet with various national leaders. These young men were the winners in the Star's annual World Affairs Contest, and I would like to take this opportunity to not only congratulate them for their outstanding accomplishment, but also salute the Minneapolis Star for its role in staging this most educational and worthwhile event.

I am particularly pleased that a young man from my congressional district was one of the contest winners. He is Mark Weissenfels, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard J. Weissenfels, from Eau Claire, Wis.

The other five winners were: Sam Griffith, Sandstone, Minn.; Robert Shaff, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; James Thompson, Red Wing, Minn.; William Watson, St. Louis Park, Minn.; and Allan Valgemae, Robbinsdale, Minn.

The Minneapolis Star has for a long time recognized the importance of world affairs in developing the thinking of young people in the Upper Midwest. For the past 22 years the Star, in conjunction with the University of Minnesota, has sponsored the world affairs program.

The program was begun to help students increase their understanding of the important events of our time. Since its inception in 1946, more than 500,000 high school students and countless numbers of adult readers and study group members have participated in the program.

The editors of the Minneapolis Star believe that the fast-developing nature of international and national events requires a timely service such as this which extends beyond the scope of social science textbooks.

Each spring, some 9,000 junior and senior high school students in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin compete in a series of written tests that provide a comprehensive final check on the students' work during the year.

The Star provides an annual study guide; weekly background articles enlarging the outlines presented in the guide; and weekly tests on current events and the weekly topics.

Program materials are offered without charge and without any newspaper subscription tie in.

The "World Affairs Study Guide" is the advance key to the subjects to be analyzed during the school year. The topics and outlines are selected and written by a panel of experienced educators and newsmen who have taken into account current developments, significant international trends, and the program's long-range study plan.

The weekly background articles provide up-to-the-minute world affairs information. The weekly tests are published in the Star. These tests are divided into two parts: the first deals with current major national and international news and the second checks the background article.

The Star also publishes a "World Affairs Teacher" which is occasionally distributed to participating teachers as a means of exchanging teachers' techniques in using the program.

The first round of the competition for

entrants is a qualifying test, covering the year's work, which is taken in the regular classroom. Thereafter, about 50 students are invited to Minneapolis for the final examinations at the annual world affairs roundup.

This year approximately 60,000 students participated in the study course. The six winners named above were awarded a trip to Washington. Other finalists were awarded reference and gift books. Teachers and schools also received recognition, and special prizes were presented to junior high school participants.

The fact that this year more than 60,000 young men and women participated in this program, and more than 1,000 teachers in 800 upper Midwest schools, is an indication of the tremendous acceptance this program has.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call this excellent program to the attention of my colleagues. I think it has served a most useful purpose for educators and students alike. I salute the six young men who distinguished themselves in this year's contest, and I commend the Minneapolis Star and the University of Minnesota for undertaking a program which is so important and far reaching in its effect on young men and women in the upper Midwest.

SUPREME COURT RULES FOR LAW

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years now, the police officers of our Nation have been so restricted by technicalities handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court, that it is becoming more and more difficult for these officers to provide adequate protection for the majority of the people.

Many officers—men who dedicated their lives to their profession—have sought other employment because of these restrictive measures.

For months now, I have been speaking out against these decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court. I feel, very strongly, that current trend must be reversed. And I am happy to perceive on the horizon an aroused citizenry who are demanding enforcement of our laws and better consideration for the men who protect us, our police officers.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Extensions of Remarks a very timely editorial on this subject from the Gadsden Times, Gadsden, Ala., and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SUPREME COURT RULES FOR LAW

The United States is made up for the most part of law-abiding citizens who seek to live within the boundaries of the statutes and who expect law-enforcement officials to do their job.

For that reason, it is gratifying to know that the Supreme Court of the United States has made at least one decision to enable officers to do their job. Hopefully, this will be just the first step to bring effective law-enforcement back to our nation.

The new decision stipulates that an officer may stop and search a suspect without the benefit of search warrant if he observes suspicious behavior. In addition, if any weapon is uncovered during the course of this action, it may be introduced as evidence in court proceedings.

The court rules this "reasonable" if the officer fears that his questions might be answered with a bullet or knife blade.

Eight of the nine justices agreed. Justice William O. Douglas dissented, saying his colleagues gave police officers the power to stop and frisk before establishing (presumably by warrant) probable cause, and have taken "a long step down the totalitarian path."

This sort of reasoning may protect the individual would-be law-breaker, but certainly given no comfort to the majority. While the warrant is being obtained, a crime may be perpetrated. An officer must be able to exercise judgment.

With this decision, the Supreme Court has taken a step in the direction of protecting the majority, taking away the initiative of immunity that would-be law-breakers enjoyed.

We hope that other sweeping changes are forthcoming.

Law enforcement has been snarled by judicial tape which must be unraveled if law and order are to be ours.—P.M.

A RARE YOUNG MAN

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Idaho Free Press and Caldwell News-Tribune brought to my attention the story of a young man in my district who instead of sitting around waiting for help, as so many of today's young people are wont to do, has seized the opportunities available to him and is overcoming obstacles as too many others will not.

Richard Nava's story is an inspiration to all of us in Idaho. I wish this editorial could be read by all of the residents of Resurrection City as proof that the solution to their problems does not lie only in the Government handout.

The editorial follows:

A RARE YOUNG MAN

What our nation needs to remain great is a couple of million young men like Richard Nava (Garcia).

Chances are that you've never heard of Richard Nava. Many of his Nampa High School senior classmates don't even know him very well.

Richard doesn't have time for extracurricular activities. He's working his way through high school. Just a few more weeks and the fruits of his effort will blossom.

Richard has been on his own for four years now. His parents are migrant workers, residing in Texas. If he had remained with them, he'd be moving from place to place and probably wouldn't be very far along in his secondary education.

But Richard is a most unusual person. He remained in Idaho when his parents moved back to Texas and he hasn't seen them in four years. He worked for three years at a department store in Caldwell, attending ninth, 10th and 11th grades. Last year he was transferred to Nampa and he enrolled as a senior at Nampa High School.

How many young men do you know with the drive to work their way through high school, living entirely upon what they earn?

Not once has this young man asked for any form of public assistance, we've been told. He says he doesn't believe in welfare.

Richard doesn't have much spare time, what with working and studying to maintain a "B" average. But when he does, he likes to visit acquaintances in the Caldwell Labor Camp. He goes there to encourage parents to keep their children in school—and to prove to the youngsters there that it pays to get an education.

Richard isn't stopping when he receives his diploma this month.

His sights are set on a higher goal. He will attend Boise College next fall. He wants to prepare himself for either a teaching job or a business administration career.

And, of course, he has lined up a job in Boise so he can continue to work for his education.

How many Richard Navas do we have in the United States? Unfortunately, not many. But we can be proud that such a young man is a resident of our area and we can hope others will follow the splendid example he has set.

AMERICAN TRAGEDY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Sloane of Springfield, Va., writes a column which appears regularly in the Manchester, N.H., Union Leader.

In the Union Leader of June 18, 1968, Mr. Sloane reviewed a new book, "Incident at Boris Gleb—The Tragedy of Newcomb Mott," by DeWitt S. Copp. His review was so beautifully written, I should like to call attention to it by including it as a part of the RECORD.

Mr. Sloane's review, in full, reads as follows:

NEWCOMB MOTT, MARTYR: AMERICAN TRAGEDY
(By Edward J. Sloane)

Sometimes the reading of a book is an all-enveloping experience. One is drawn into a hall of mirrors, a terrible place of echoing images and glassy eyes. One struggles to emerge into the world of light from the evil dream. Such a book is an event from which one never recovers, and one continues to be haunted by its echoes. Such a book is "Incident at Boris Gleb The Tragedy of Newcomb Mott" by De Witt S. Copp, publisher: Doubleday, March 1968. Get it, even if you have to buy it. Read it slowly. You'll take a trip. You'll never recover.

Newcomb Mott was a young American from our "real" world (home; Sheffield, Mass. College: Antioch, 1960. Job: College textbook salesman. Status in September 1965: On an interesting vacation in northern Norway.)

On the morning of Saturday, Sept. 4, 1965, Newcomb Mott took a walk from the small Norwegian town in which he was staying for a few days, wandered accidentally across the border into Russia, and never returned to our world again. He was entrapped by a robot in a hall of mirrors and murdered. The robot was the KGB, or, Soviet Secret Police, who had a job to do, and he was the "accident." The hall of mirrors was the Russian civil law.

Newcomb Mott was an American Tragedy of our times because he was one of those fine, sensitive, honest fellows (like the President of a famous University in New York City) who believe IT does not exist, that IT cannot happen to THEM. He was probably (the book indicates) smiling and shrugging

his shoulders to the very end, saying: "Oh, come off it—it can't be so." But it was and is so. He has entrapped in a "reverse society" of mirrors, where guilt is determined by policy.

Newcomb Mott, American tourist, wandered into a nondescript Russian village on the border of northern Norway named Boris Gleb, a hopped-up KGB trap to pick up paties, when necessary. The little people, the Intourist group, which is a KGB front, had to call their KGB bosses in Murmansk, who had to call their bosses in Moscow. The Boris Gleb people, who peddle cheap Vodka most of the time to Norwegians on their motor scooters, had picked up an American tourist who had stumbled into this place by mistake. He could be traded for a professional Russian spy named Ivanov being held at the time in the U.S. for passing information to the Russian embassy in Washington on the control system of the American Strategic Air Command.

A charge was therefore brought against Mott. He was convicted of the crime of illegally crossing the USSR border at Boris Gleb, and sentenced to 1½ years hard labor by a regional court at Murmansk, USSR. The main characteristic of the trial was that the ACT of crossing the border, once established was sufficient to convict him. The intent of Newcomb Mott was irrelevant. He was guilty and innocent (lack of intent) was impossible to prove. Stacked. The State Department refused to trade Ivanov for Mott.

On his way to a Siberian prison camp on Jan. 20, 1966, Newcomb Mott died, probably at the hands of Russian criminals on the train. It looks like a tragic goof. The circumstances surrounding his murder are one of the tragic mysteries of our time. "Suicide" is the Washington Star's answer. (See Gwertzman "Interpretive Report, The Case for Consular Pact," Jan. 27, 1967). The U.S. Embassy in Moscow on April 25, 1966, delivered its final note on the case: "Impossible to arrive at . . . the means by which his death came about."

In this time of the phony "detente," the Mott case is "must reading" for you, gentle reader. Try it. It's a real trip (armchair) into the terror.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial about guns, published in the San Augustine, Tex., Rambler, on June 13, 1968. It was written by publisher and owner, Sam Malone, and expresses the sentiments of a great majority of the people of east Texas and Texas and the Southwest as a whole.

The editorial follows:

WHAT IS THE ANSWER?

(By Sam Malone)

As Texans and the rest of the nation pause in an aftermath of the slaying of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, with saddened hearts and remorseful minds, solutions in meeting the menaces of anarchy in America keep popping up from many sources.

"Do away with firearms altogether," is the direct action of many of our leaders and groups.

"Control firearms strictly," others reiterate. Just why the hue and cry comes against firearms is a puzzle to this writer.

Guns are harmless. A gun is a piece of

metal fitted together with precision manufacturing and is designed to send a projectile from the grooved barrel.

It is the people who use them who create the danger.

Why our national leaders do not actually come forth with determined effort to enforce laws already existing without trying to throw off the responsibility of a lack of enforcement back to firearms instead of where it belongs.

All the hue and cry by national leadership to "insure civil liberties" and "protect the downtrodden peoples" has been the chief reason we are having the problems of increased criminal activities today.

Sen. Kennedy had not even been pronounced dead at the hospital until a Civil Liberties Union representative was at the jailhouse working to insure that the murdered "receive his civil rights".

We are certainly for equal rights "under the law" for every citizen of America. But these rights also carry the responsibility of abiding by the laws of our land.

When the U.S. Supreme Court goes to great lengths to protect the lawbreaker and murderers and our own State lawmakers in Texas handle our law enforcement officials so they are unable to protect the rights of all citizens in stopping crimes "already in progress"—then the time is just about here when things should take a turn toward a different direction.

We say "almost" because things will undoubtedly get considerably worse before they get any better.

This writer always worked on the premise that if you break laws, punishment was sure to follow. If you killed—with any method from guns to bow and arrows—you stood in the threat of death by verdict of a jury. Nowadays the popular theme is "let us all work together to rehabilitate the murdered and be sure to protect his civil rights."

When the law enforcement officers of America are ordered to stand by and observe people rioting, looting, murdering, and raping innocent victims, we have the hard core of a disease which cannot be laid to the doorstep of firearms.

If legislation actually removed all guns from the hands of Americans, the present philosophy that we must, at all costs, "protect the guilty" and at the expense of good, law-abiding citizens—then all will be for naught.

It is unfortunate that Sen. Kennedy was murdered. To our way of thinking it is twice as unfortunate that two U.S. Marine officers were murdered the same night in Washington because two human beings died needlessly instead of only one.

It is our sincere prayer and hope that our national leadership will wake up to lawlessness and decide to take action to stop it throughout the land instead of only trying to control ownership of guns.

Many of us Texans would like to keep our firearms to enjoy hunting wild game and to protect our homes—when threatened with mob violence.

WHERE THE PROTEST?

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, to a distressing extent, the savagery of the Vietcong has intensified against the civilian population in Vietnam. With the shelling of Saigon and the atrocities committed while so-called "peace" negotiations are

going on in Paris, the escalation of the war by the Vietcong is shocking.

More than 2 years ago I made a report to my colleagues detailing the terrible practices of the Vietcong in slaying the provincial leaders while we were endeavoring to establish the pacification and rehabilitation program. This was at the time there was so much protest in this country over our Nation's involvement in South Vietnam.

With the increasing American casualty lists and the heavy toll of Vietnamese civilians, I thought it was important that we indicate that the public is aware of these conditions. The following editorial which appeared in the *Huntington, Ind., Herald-Press* is, in my opinion, a valid statement of conditions in Saigon:

WHERE THE PROTEST?

Pictures of terrible scenes of destruction and suffering in Saigon are appearing. They illustrate columns of type detailing what the civilian population of the city faces. Refugees trudge hopelessly and helplessly through streets of rubble lined by demolished buildings that were homes. Women carry children, frightened children cling to mothers' skirts, try to hide from unseen danger. Bodies of the dead are shown in some of the pictures. The maimed are all about.

The procession of death and misery is the work of the Viet Cong, whose indiscriminate shower of rockets on the city falls heaviest on the civilians, the babies, the little children, whole families. More, and worse, terror is promised.

It is strange about this vicious, brutal attack upon a civilian population. No marching, sign carrying, slogan shouting bands move over streets of our cities in frenzied protest against this wanton killing of the innocent. No meetings are called to hear fervent voices raised in ardent protestation. No professors, nor clergymen, nor senators have proclaimed the right of dissent to a policy that brings indiscriminate slaughter to babes, children, women, the aged, the invalid, men, the strong, the weak, the infirm, the sound, the healthy in the sorrowful city of Saigon.

IS IT ALL WORTHWHILE?

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Owen Hansen, city editor of the *Lebanon, Ind., Reporter*, has recently returned from Vietnam where he reported on the war as seen through the eyes of central Indiana servicemen.

Owen didn't cover the war from the press club in Saigon.

He obtained the names of Boone County servicemen prior to his trip overseas, and after arriving in Vietnam, diligently hunted up as many Hoosier soldiers as time allowed.

Hansen's series of interviews provided his readers with a firsthand account of a war that is now the longest in American history.

Since returning home, Owen has written a column relating his views on the Vietnam war. While not pretending to have all the answers, Hansen has some perceptive and intuitive comments about

the war that will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

Particularly disturbing are Hansen's account of the incredible restrictions and ground rules that favor the enemy, and the prospects for a war lasting 10 to 15 more years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, Mr. Hansen's column is published below in its entirety. The article follows:

IS IT ALL WORTHWHILE?

(By Owen Hansen)

Normally, a visit to Vietnam by a Congressman or newsmen makes him an expert in foreign affairs. He comes back with all of the answers wrapped up neatly in a package from which he dips frequently during political tours, speeches and banquets.

Quite the contrary is true in my case. I left Lebanon with all of the answers concerning Vietnam and returned more confused about it all than when I departed.

Nevertheless, I have reached some conclusions—gleaned mostly from interviews with the troops, officers, and fellow newsmen while I was in Vietnam.

I cannot say we are winning the war. It seems we are defending a country but to call the role of the Allies victorious would be folly. This, however, does not mean that America's position in the war is unjustified. It is evident that Communism would sweep through the southern half of that war-torn nation should America abandon its effort in the conflict.

The Americans want an easy answer to a most difficult problem.

What they seem to be getting is a program of conflict with apparently little plan. We are allowing the North Vietnamese to infiltrate the south at an unprecedented rate. We are allowing the stranglehold around Saigon to tighten day by day. We are allowing the build-up of an arms cache in the mid-lands and the north with which strong attacks someday will have to be repelled at the cost of hundreds of American lives.

Our plan to equip the South Vietnamese to fight their own battles is somewhat of a farce. We equip them with M-1 and M-2 rifles which we used ourselves during World War II. We give them fighter planes of pre-Korean War vintage and we offer them only a look at a missile system. Yet, north of the 17th parallel, NVA Armies are being supplied with the top Chicom AK-47 rifle, MIG fighter planes and a very effective missile program.

We allow the North Vietnamese to invade South Vietnam but we stop at the DMZ in any role we may attempt when on the offensive.

Many of our military leaders are befuddled over the war's strategy and frankly admit it. They do not like the role of mere defenders. "To win we must go on the offensive," one major told me.

Whether this would end the war, I cannot answer. Whether the loss of lives would justify the victory we gain is questionable. We must realize that we are fighting in Vietnam a hard fighter and one who fights his kind of war. He does not die easily. He does not stop in the middle of his tour for an R&R. He does not go home after a 12-month tour of duty. He is led by a brilliant military strategist in General Giap; one who has learned the element of surprise through guerrilla-type combat. He realizes his armies are no match for the mechanized might of America so he fights his kind of hit and run war.

The body count—the first war ever that we have resorted to such a practice to determine who is winning—is fictitious. The daily 4 p.m. "Follies" as they are called held by the Joint US Public Affairs Office in Saigon, are laughed at by newsmen who have been on

the scene of fighting. They question the credibility gap between what they have seen and what they are told.

There is no clear cut answer to the Vietnamese problem. What seems certain is that the Paris "Peace Talks" will resolve little in clear fashion. A coalition government will never be effective and fair to both sides.

What most military leaders and seasoned reporters suggest is for America to either get "in" or get "out" of the war fully. If they should stay in they should take the offensive and blitz everything that bespeaks of North Vietnamese. If they should get out, they take the chance of the country being overrun by the red menace.

The observations do not come easily once you have been in the country. But, I feel the effort there is floundering despite the hardships of the many who are killed and wounded.

In our present course, the war could last another 10-15 years.

CONTEMPT FOR LAW AT HEART OF VIOLENCE—FBI DIRECTOR

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there are many different views on the cause of the breakdown in law and order that our country has experienced in recent years. Almost every conceivable reason or excuse has been given for the increase in the crime rate. Every segment of our population has been blamed except the criminal element itself.

We have had all sorts of commissions appointed to study the problem. There was the Riot Commission, the Crime Commission, and the Commission on Violence. These Commissions have spent months and many thousands of dollars studying the problem. Their answer is usually that society is to blame for the breakdown in law and order.

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, who has been head of the FBI since its beginning, has a theory on this problem that I subscribe to. Mr. Hoover is held in high esteem by Americans everywhere. There is certainly no credibility gap in Mr. Hoover's remarks about the situation that exists in our country today. I was impressed by an interview with Mr. Hoover which appeared in the *Sunday, June 23, issue of the Birmingham News*, and I include this interview in the *Record* at this point. This interview originally appeared in the *Pontiac, Mich., Press*.

The interview follows:

HOOPER HITS CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: CONTEMPT FOR LAW AT HEART OF VIOLENCE—FBI DIRECTOR

(NOTE.—J. Edgar Hoover, as director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the nation's No. 1 law enforcement officer, was asked a wide range of questions regarding the growing violence in the nation, civil disobedience, the role of the FBI, major crime problems and other significant areas of law and order. The interview with Hoover, answering questions from Harold A. Fitzgerald, chairman of the board, *The Pontiac Press*.)

PONTIAC, MICH.—J. Edgar Hoover says that "a rising contempt of and disrespect for law and order lies at the heart of the growing violence in America today."

The long-time director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation made the statement in reply to a series of questions from Harold A. Fitzgerald, chairman of the board of The Pontiac (Mich.) Press.

Hoover also condemned civil disobedience as "a pernicious doctrine which is undermining respect for law and order." At the same time, he said the Communist Party was "elated to see Americans denounce other Americans, to see incidents of civil disobedience, to see the growing disdain for the law."

On gun control, one of the most pressing issues in the U.S. today, Hoover called for the banning of "mall order firearms purchases." He said interstate transportation of firearms should be controlled and local registration of weapons be required and enforced.

CONTEMPT OF LAW AND ORDER

Following is the text of the questions and answers:

"Q. What is your opinion as our nation's leading law enforcement officer is the main cause behind the violence which is sweeping our country?

"A. A rising contempt of and disrespect for law and order lies at the heart of the growing violence in America today. This disrespect is reflected in many ways: a spiraling crime rate, riots, civil disobedience, rebellion on our campuses, and the rise of extremist racial and vigilante groups. Respect for law and order is the cement which holds the varied and often hostile groups of a democracy together.

"The moment individuals or groups distrust the law and attempt, through coercion, intimidation or violence, to take matters into their own hands, the orderly fabric of society bursts. This is what we are seeing today.

"Q. What are your views on civil disobedience?

"A. Civil disobedience is a pernicious doctrine which is undermining respect for law and order. Proponents of this doctrine assert that civil disobedience is justifiable if the acts are open, not violent, respectful of the rights of others, and have the purpose of focusing attention on significant moral issues of the day.

"To individuals enthused about a current moral problem, to appeal to civil disobedience may seem great. But to break the law even 'gently' can have eventual tragic consequences.

"Suppose every group or individual who felt he had a righteous cause did likewise? What would happen? We would have chaos. Moreover, what starts out as a planned, controlled incident of civil disobedience may mushroom into open violence or riots. Also, if the situation falls under the influence of extremists or avowed agitators, great damage can result.

"REEMPHASIZED MUTUAL TRUST

"Q. Respect for law and order seems passe. What has brought our country to this situation?

"A. We are living in an age when too many citizens are thinking about their 'rights' and 'privileges' and too little about their 'duties' and 'responsibilities.' The emphasis today is too heavily weighted on the permissiveness of the individual—that anything he feels best for himself he should do regardless of how it may affect others.

"Respect for the law means respect for the rights of others. America needs a re-emphasis on community cooperation, mutual trust and the responsibility of the individual.

"Q. Has the Communist Party sought to capitalize on this breakdown in respect for law and order?

"A. The Communist Party, USA, is busily attempting to capitalize on the current social unrest, divisiveness and tensions in our society. Not since the depression days of the 1930's has the Communist Party had such a fertile field of discontent to exploit.

"Social chaos and disorder are tailor made

for the growth of the Communist virus. The party is elated to see Americans denounce other Americans, to see incidents of civil disobedience, to see the growing disdain for the law.

"ROLE OF FBI DURING RIOTS

"Q. What is the role of the FBI in civil disorders?

"A. The FBI's responsibility is to develop and disseminate intelligent information while remaining alert to any violations of federal law within its investigative jurisdiction. It does not have jurisdiction to protect either property or persons or to police riot situations.

"Q. What should I do if lawless elements approach my store or home?

"A. In cases of possible violence, local law enforcement authorities should immediately be furnished all available information. Citizens should not attempt to organize vigilante groups for protection purposes.

"Q. What can news media do to aid local law enforcement when a breakdown in law and order occurs?

"A. Report the facts promptly and accurately. In situations of lawlessness, great damage is done by false rumors and gossip. The news media can render tremendous aid to the restoration of law and order—or in preventing disorder—by fair and honest reporting.

"On the other hand, a disservice is performed if the news media overemphasize extremist statements by agitators or report isolated incidents of violence as indicative of general conditions. The news media can aid by promptly transmitting to the public any instructions issued by the authorities such as hours of curfew, data relative to traffic conditions and areas where citizens should not travel.

"WHAT CAN CITIZEN DO?

"Q. What types of positive action can citizens take in helping reverse our constantly rising crime rate?

"A. Attempt to remedy the conditions, such as poverty, discrimination, poor housing, which help breed crime;

"2. Obey the laws themselves—not scoff at traffic tickets, cheat on income tax returns, poke fun at law enforcement officers;

"3. Be willing to pay the taxes necessary to give the local police officers the equipment, personnel and training they need. Police salaries are far too low. We must recognize that effective protection costs money—your money;

4. Accept personal responsibility—to serve on an anticrime commission, work with young people, help clear an old field for a playground;

"5. Report pertinent information immediately to the proper authorities. Too many Americans today are unwilling to cooperate with law enforcement, even refusing to furnish vital data in their possession;

"6. Don't be a silent confederate of the criminal by leaving your keys in the car, your front door unlocked at night or a ladder by a rear window;

"7. Be optimistic. Crime is not an incurable disease. It can be reduced or even eliminated.

"CRIMES DURING SUMMER

"Q. What are some of the major crime problems we are likely to encounter this summer?

"A. Serious crimes against the person, such as murder, rape, and aggravated assault, increase during the summer months. Summer abets the operation of gangs and hoodlum lawlessness. Also, if extremist groups and individuals continue to inflame communities, the possibility exist that civil disorders and riots may again erupt in urban areas.

"Q. What are some of the problems encountered by the FBI in its fight against the forces of organized crime?

"A. A major difficulty is public indifference, stemming partly from the 'why should I get involved?' attitude and partly from the fact

that the products of organized crime appeal to some segments of the population.

"This was true, for example, during Prohibition days when people wanted liquor and saw nothing wrong with patronizing a murderous bootlegger to get it. It is true today with respect to gambling, in that naive persons fail to realize that by doing business with bookmakers and policy operators they are making it possible for the hoodlum element to bribe police, amass gigantic fortunes, and undermine our society.

"Another difficulty is the fantastic amount of money available to the underworld, permitting hoodlums to influence legislation, bribe police, and pay off judges and juries to win acquittals when they have to stand trial.

"A third difficulty is the ostensibly reputable positions many hoodlums hold in their communities, mainly because their wealth enables them to engage in legitimate business, live in expensive neighborhoods, and contribute to various worthy causes.

"APATHY RELATED TO WEALTH

"To be expected, this sense of wealth and respectability is a major cause of the public's apathy regarding their activities.

"A fourth problem is the ruthlessness of the organized underworld and the number of gunmen at its disposal to kill or intimidate witnesses, enforce discipline, and actually wage minor 'wars' when the occasion demands.

"This ruthlessness has instilled great fear in the underworld—and in some communities—and is chiefly responsible for the notorious code of 'omerta'—or 'silence'—which often protects hoodlums from effective prosecution.

"Q. Mr. Hoover, would you care to identify some of the organizations which are today undermining respect for law and order?

"A. The Communist Party and its fronts have for years taught disrespect for our laws. Also, we have a number of extremist groups, both of the right and the left, such as the Ku Klux Klan, Minutemen, Nation of Islam, Revolutionary Action Movement, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNCC.

"Recently, a New Left student group, the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—has encouraged resistance to the draft and general hostility to our democratic structure of government.

"GUN MISUSE INCREASES

"Q. What role does the use of firearms play in criminal violence?

"A. During 1967, serious assaults where a gun was used as a weapon rose 22 percent over the previous year, and one out of every five assaults was committed with a gun.

"For the criminal, the gun represents one of the most readily available, deadly and easily used weapons in the arsenal of violence.

"Q. Does the FBI have any evidence indicating that last summer's riots were the results of activities of subversive elements as distinguished from spontaneous actions by minority groups?

"A. The riots of 1967—and previous years—were characterized by spontaneous outbreaks of violence, and no evidence has been developed to reflect they were part of any over-all conspiracy. However, we must never overlook the fact that the Communists and other subversive groups like to 'fish in troubled waters' and seek to exploit explosive social situations.

"SET GOOD EXAMPLES

"Q. What can citizens do to help foster a renewal in the spirit of obeying the law?

"A. Citizens can set a personal example of obeying the law themselves and encouraging others to do likewise. Far too many adults set bad examples for others to follow. We must encourage respect for our flag, our history, our principles of free government. Young people in particular must learn the significance of the law. Respect for law is

not something to be learned in 'one big bite' but is the result of living this principle day after day.

"Q. How can private citizens assist the law enforcement officer when civil disorders erupt?

"A. 1. Obey the instructions of the police or other authorities on the scene;

"2. Encourage others to do likewise;

"3. Don't circulate rumors and misinformation;

"4. Furnish promptly pertinent data to the local authorities;

"5. Don't condone lawlessness, rioting and looting. They are wrong;

"6. Remember that, as a private citizen, you, too, are part of law and order.

"RIOTS INJURE COMMUNITY

"Q. When riots occur in one section of a city, how effective is police protection in the entire community?

"A. A riot necessitates the immediate dispatch of large numbers of police personnel to the affected areas. As expected, this reduces the number of officers and the equipment available for duty in other sections of the city. Citizens in these areas do not receive the protection to which they are entitled. Moreover, if an officer is injured, he may be off duty for a number of days or weeks, thus reducing available manpower. In every possible way, riots injure the community.

"Q. Where does the student 'New Left' fit into this picture of chaos?

"A. The student 'New Left,' especially the Students for a Democratic Society, has become blatantly hostile to law and order. These students have engaged in civil disobedience, harassed military and industrial recruiters on campus, counseled evasion of the draft, and heckled government officials speaking at college programs. They have kidnaped university officials, rifled private papers, and engaged in vandalism and theft. These new leftists detest our democratic government and constitutional processes.

"They talk about 'resistance' and 'revolution' and work to destroy not only the university, but our institutions of society. Their viewpoint is anarchistic and nihilistic. The SDS uses a Marxist vocabulary, emulates a Leninist organizational structure, and welcomes Communists into membership. The Communist party is working feverishly to recruit members from the new left and direct its actions. Here arises a great danger.

"ASKS FIREARM RESTRICTIONS

"Q. Has the FBI taken any stand concerning legislation to restrict the use of firearms?

"A. Better control of firearms is not only desirable, but necessary. In my opinion, mail-order firearms purchases should be banned, interstate transportation of firearms controlled and local registration of weapons required and enforced. The chief responsibility is local, but federal assistance must strongly complement—state gun legislation.

"Q. If I recognize rioters, looters, and arsonists, should I report them to the authorities by name? Am I endangering myself if I do?

"A. Yes, you should report them by name. Not to do so is a failure of the citizen's duty and would mean handicapping the investigating officers. The risk in not reporting this information is far greater than any temporary security gained by overlooking it.

"Q. Was there evidence of heavy involvement of criminal elements in the recent riots?

"A. Our identification division carefully analyzed the fingerprint cards forwarded by local authorities as a result of arrests during the riots. These reflected a heavy involvement of criminal elements. Of 1,089 fingerprint submissions from Newark, 708, or 65 per cent, white and Negro individuals were found to have prior records on file. About one-half of the over-all fingerprint cards were of individuals in the 18- to 25-year-old age group.

"As to the 1,060 fingerprint cards submitted by the Detroit authorities, 464 or 44 per cent, of the white and Negro individuals arrested had prior criminal records.

"Q. Does the FBI have evidence indicating an increase in criminal violence against the law enforcement officer?

"A. Criminal violence against law enforcement officers is increasing. In 1967, a total of some 75 officers were killed while performing their official duties, compared with 57 police officers in 1966.

"APATHY IS CRIME'S ALLY

"Disrespect for the officer of the law has reached a new high in America. Officers are falsely charged with brutality, heckled, called obscene names, verbally abused. Many good citizens, by indifference, fear of personal involvement and lack of interest in police problems, are unwitting allies of violence in American society."

SOSS, WOOD COMMENT—NEW GUN LAW NOT LIKED HERE

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, listed below is one of the best articles I have seen in regard to the legislation to control the sale of firearms. This was printed in the McCook, Nebr., Daily Gazette on Thursday, June 20. I would like to share these views with the Members in view of their extreme importance.

The article follows:

SOSS, WOOD COMMENT—NEW GUN LAW NOT LIKED HERE

(By Jack Rogers)

"I would trade all the gun laws they could write for the right to prosecute the guilty and then, once found guilty, have them properly punished."

This comment, made by Red Willow County Attorney J. D. Wood Jr., echoes just one phase of the feeling of local law enforcement agencies to the proposed gun laws.

Generally, local law enforcement officers look with a great deal of disfavor on any new gun legislation.

Wood said if Congress were interested in restoring law and order, they would be better off getting some recent Supreme Court decisions changed so law enforcement agencies can act like they are supposed to.

He pointed out it is discouraging to police to be constantly condemned by the courts.

Wood said the present makeup of the U.S. Supreme Court does not include one person who has served as an appellate judge. He said one Justice was a justice of the peace at one time.

He suggested Congress make experience as an appellate judge one of the requirements for appointment to the Supreme Court.

He said the net result of the Supreme Court decisions in many cases has been that authorities can't prosecute the guilty persons because of some procedural rule.

"The police are so restricted they can't act properly—that is the problem."

The County Attorney noted he cannot think of a case he has prosecuted in which a new gun restriction would have helped him.

Wood said of all crimes of violence, by taking out all of those involving firearms, 96 per cent would remain.

Both Wood and Police Chief Glenn Soss agreed those who want a gun badly enough will get one.

PROMOTE BOOTLEGGING

Soss said he felt it would encourage a big bootlegging operation in firearms and would certainly increase the price of firearms.

The two also agreed the only ones such a law would affect would be the honest, law abiding citizens. They would turn in their weapons while the criminals would pay absolutely no attention to it.

Soss went further and said he felt such restrictions, if they continue, will have the effect of either disarming the honest citizens and leaving the criminals and police in sole possession of weapons or make the honest citizen a law violator because he doesn't want to give up his guns.

Soss said he felt one reason why this part of the country is relatively free of major violent crimes is because the majority of people own a firearm of some kind. A would-be rapist or killer knows this, Soss said, and will think twice before taking a chance on getting his head blown off.

One argument that has been advanced by those favoring more gun restrictions is it would reduce the number of so called "crimes of passion" where the killing is done in a sudden act of temper.

Both Wood and Soss said they believed this argument was not realistic.

They agreed in crimes of passion the victim is usually killed by the weapon of opportunity. If a gun was not handy, a knife would be used or even a baseball bat.

WHAT IS THE TREASURY POLICY IN RESPECT TO GOLD?

HON. JAMES A. MCCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a constituent of mine sent me a letter he had received from the Treasury Department. A portion of that letter reads as follows:

The current restrictions on the acquisition and ownership of gold by American citizens are being maintained because they are regarded as essential to the purposes of the agreements concluded on March 17 and to our policy of conserving the Government's present gold stock for international monetary purposes. Under current circumstances, it is very important that we minimize the substantial increment to world demand for gold particularly for speculative purposes which might be inherent in the United States. If the licensing system were ended, rising U.S. demand for the limited supply of gold available could come not only from speculators but also from the substantial financial resources at the disposal of legitimate industrial users anxious to assure a long run supply. The licensing system not only keeps speculators out of the market but effectively limits the inventory holdings of industrial users among which are virtually all the large American corporations.

Recently, the Wall Street Journal carried an article on the same subject in which the administration is whistling quite a different tune. The story said:

Some U.S. Government officials are starting to consider the possibility of making gold freely available for hoarding and trading by American citizens, it was learned.

One consideration that could speed such a move is the possibility that only this drastic change in U. S. policy would prompt gold-producing South Africa to start marketing some of its precious metal.

It was my understanding that in demonetizing gold, Treasury had relinquished all interest in the metal. As a matter of fact, the glowing statements that came out of the Treasury Depart-

ment when the special drawing rights bill was before us led me to believe that the end of the rainbow had settled at 15th and Pennsylvania, and that Secretary Fowler had found the pot there filled with paper.

But Treasury says it is not interested in gold. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only paraphrase a line in the play "Wonderful Town": "For a place with no neon and a bad location, they're doing one whale of a business."

Or we might turn Shakespeare around and say, "What is prologue has passed." For now, it is becoming evident that even Treasury officials suspect the only really safe money is gold.

And they do not believe that the price of gold will go down on a free market. The prospect of gold prices tumbling has always been one of their main objections to private ownership of the metal.

In an effort to bring this matter before Congress, I recently introduced a bill to permit private citizens to buy and hold gold. Although I consider such a step vital in view of the inflationary pressures on our economy, it takes on added significance in view of another statement in the Journal's story which says that Secretary Fowler already possesses the authority to permit private gold holdings.

In a matter of this importance, I think the final decision should rest with Congress and not a member of the President's Cabinet. I hope that hearings on my bill will be held shortly and that they will serve as a vehicle for determining just what Treasury policy is with respect to gold.

WALKER COUNTY SHOWS HOW

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Walker County are extremely proud, and justifiably so, of Walker College. This is a 2-year independent institution in Jasper, Ala., which is located in my congressional district.

In 1956, Walker College had an enrollment of only 32 students. Since then, due to a determined effort on the part of its president, Dr. David J. Rowland, and many interested citizens, Walker College has become fully accredited with a 750 student-body enrollment, and a 36-acre campus full of new and renovated buildings and a secure financial position.

At this time, I insert in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial reprinted from the Birmingham News which shows what a community can do when it wants to support a small, independent school and wants to do it on a pay-as-you-go basis:

WALKER COUNTY SHOWS HOW

Over in Walker County, sometimes referred to as a depressed area, is an inspiring story of local pride, sacrifice and action.

Walker College is a two-year independent institution in Jasper which in 1956 had an enrollment of only 32 students on its two-block campus. Dr. David J. Rowland became president of the college that year, took a long

look at the school and embarked on a series of fund drives which have resulted in a fully accredited status, 750 students, a 36-acre campus full of new and renovated buildings and a secure financial position.

But the significant aspect of this success story is not just that it was done, but that it was done on a pay-as-you-go basis, and largely through local funds from a county generally characterized as "poor."

Four weeks ago the school began a \$1 million fund raising drive to celebrate its 30th anniversary. The goal is sought in two phases—the first half to be raised in Walker and surrounding counties, the rest to come over a longer period of time through alumni, foundations and bequests.

Dr. Rowland and drive chairman Sam Murphy, a Jasper manufacturer, settled down for a long run at the first half-million. They were surprised, and gratified, at the outpouring of pledges from local people: \$400,000 is on the books and the goal should be reached by the end of the month.

There has been some talk about the demise of the private colleges. The story of Walker College, with no state or church backing and little help from foundations, proves that if a local community wants to support a small school, it can—without running up a huge debt on capital growth expenditures.

Walker Countians are proud of their effort—and justifiably so.

QUAKER POLICE PRACTICES

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in the recent, excellent "Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders," that Commission listed in level of intensity the most deeply held grievances of the Negro community. The first grievance heading the list is, "police practices."

Accordingly, I believe we should give especial consideration to the resolution of such a prominent grievance. In line with this, let us take note of the remarkable recommendation for improving police practices, and also police-ghetto relations, contained in "A Quaker Approach to Police Community Relations." This was offered in a talk presented at the 14th annual National Institute on Police and Community Relations, May 19-24, 1968, at Michigan State University. The talk was given by Ross Flanagan, secretary of the Quaker Project on Community Conflict of 217 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003.

The proposal detailed by Mr. Flanagan has been explored as part of a Buffalo, N.Y., police training project. While it is probably too early to tell results in actual practice, the proposal of Mr. Flanagan is so appealing at this critical time, that I offer it for the RECORD, as follows:

A QUAKER APPROACH TO POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

You may wonder what a Quaker is doing up here participating as a resource speaker at a Police Conference. Traditionally, we have been one of those religious groups which has sought to stand apart from violence or any institution such as the military or the police likely to be involved in it. Our emphasis, not unlike that of other religious

and social service agencies, has been that of trying to eliminate the causes of war and violence on the one hand, while helping to relieve the consequences or casualties of violence on the other.

But lately we've discovered that whether or not we want anything to do with violence, it is having something to do with us. So we have begun working on various aspects, dynamics and conditions of the problem of violence itself, in an effort to see what new methods can be discovered to help individuals, institutions and communities cope with and respond to violent situations more creatively. Put another way, our aim is to encourage all people—whatever their role in society—to expand their capacity for peace.

We have become interested and involved with the police because we have recognized that the men of your profession are most directly in touch with the violent side of American society and any effort to get at the problem must therefore begin with some appreciation of your experience.

At the same time, we have obviously brought to this new undertaking, a number of our own assumptions having to do with the present climate of violence and the role of the police. Some of the most important of these are as follows:

I. It is imperative to the welfare of American society in general and that of the police and the dissident groups in particular that some way be found to short-circuit the vicious cycle of racism—rage—fear—violence which has sprung up and been spurred on by the belligerent attitudes and actions of some white men, black men, citizens and police. Unless something is done to check this brutalizing process, people will become more and more suspicious, fearful and defensive in their ability to relate to one another, the climate will become so emotionally charged as to sabotage all significant movements and demands for change, and the job of the police will become ever more hazardous and lonely. The challenge to you as policemen, then, is to break the chain of increasingly violent action and reaction by exercising your professional capacity for patience and restraint; refusing to let your own behavior descend to that of the crowd and helping to set an example for others of what it really means to be a man.

II. The second assumption we have made in embarking upon our work in this field is that the future of the police as an institution and profession distinct from the military depends upon developing less and less violent means for ordering society. Or, as one officer from Los Angeles put it to me two years ago at this Institute: "One thing I know from experience, we sure as hell can't hold this society together with a gun." We think it well to remember the lesson learned by the U.S. military in Vietnam, namely: that firepower is a lousy substitute for manpower in coping with social revolution, and that a "show of force" is best made with men and not with weapons.

III. We are convinced that police/community relations is a two-way street; that in order for the current situation to improve, the community must sophisticate its own understanding of law, police procedure and the role of police in society. As things stand now, the police are quite often the only representatives of the community-at-large in direct and frequent contact with the residents of minority neighborhoods. If equal justice is to be assured, the white majority must not abdicate its responsibilities for holding the police accountable for their actions. At the same time, the police would seem well advised to welcome such community interest and involvement in the peace-keeping problems of the police, because the more citizens become actively concerned with police functions and difficulties, the more community support police departments are likely to get in raising salaries, modernizing facilities and recruiting men.

IV. If the police are to continue to fulfill their role as servants of the entire community, they must expose and invest themselves as much as possible in high tension neighborhoods in order that their individuality may be established in the minds and eyes of the youth and older residents. Stereotypes of the police as "the enemy" or "soldier in an occupying army" are most meaningfully challenged by the human warmth and presence of policemen—in and out of uniform, on and off duty.

V. The community at large and the police and politicians in particular ought to make every effort to identify recurring police/citizen friction points and focus community attention on their correction. No officer wants to make a fuse of himself, so the sooner he becomes aware of those situations which are most likely to trigger larger trouble, the more sensitive his own attitudes and actions are likely to become. Politicians can also benefit from an early identification of fuse situations inasmuch as they can use this information not only to pull the revealed fuse (for example, corner-lounging), but to get down to the root conditions (jobs and recreation areas) and do something about them.

VI. Significant new problems and domestic crises confronting the police make obvious the need for new and substantively different methods of training. You can't expect men trained to deal with marginal criminal elements to overnight acquire and demonstrate professional competence in the control of racial violence and social conflict. The lecture/concept approach to human relations training in which outside resource speakers attempt to educate men to abstract theories of sociology, psychology and human relations is clearly a failure. No group of human beings can be expected to absorb as much verbiage and as many different ideas as police are being bombarded with today during a few brief weeks and months of training. If training is to be helpful to the man on the beat, it must be oriented more completely to the problems he is likely to encounter there while helping him see and experience for himself a variety of more or less suitable ways in which to handle each situation.

VII. Exclusive or primary emphasis on attitude change in human-relations training for policemen is a mistake since this rarely is accomplished and moreover fails to deal with the very real problems posed by the dynamics of violence with which the men must cope. At best, attempts to change police attitudes towards minority groups frequently impose only a thin veneer of verbal and physical restraint on routine police conduct, a veneer abandoned completely when push comes to shove. At worse, training programs geared to attitude change are mentally blocked by officers understandably resistant to attempts to brainwash them into accepting liberal ideas, assumptions and values. The fact is that the police/minority relationship has been steadily strained and brutalized to the point where today many black citizens are likely to become inflamed simply by the appearance of a uniformed officer, regardless of whether he addresses them as "boys."

VIII. The relationship between the police and the minority neighborhoods is such that in time of civil disorder, there is a clear and significant need for some third party group to play a liaison and emergency service role in maintaining some sense of humanity and community amidst the embattled forces. With the politicians and police preoccupied with the struggle to restore order and the rioters disposed to defense and disorder, clearly some other group must look out for the very real problems and needs of people entrapped in the riot areas. To abandon the streets to violence and sit home watching the TV coverage of local riots as if they were another western movie is to accommodate one's soul to inhumanity. Unarmed, clearly identified,

interracial teams of citizens ought to help get the innocent to safety and the injured to treatment, while investigating and spiking rumors and notifying families of the whereabouts and welfare of their injured or arrested kin.

These, then, are the assumptions which have shaped our evolving approach to the crisis in police/community relations. Obviously, they are open to question, but we have had to begin somewhere. And so, with these general guidelines, we have begun to experiment with projects of four types:

First, workshops in high-tension neighborhoods aimed at the identification and correction of citizen complaints against the police, together with the correction of certain citizen misconceptions concerning police procedures;

Second, public meetings and other educational programs in the community at large, designed to increase public understanding of the critical role of the police and community support for higher salaries and qualifications;

Third, police recruit and in-service training courses and programs formulated to help Police Departments determine which officers will or will not respond creatively in volatile situations;

Fourth, situation briefings and instruction in first aid and other practical skills intended to prepare concerned members of the religious community and others for emergency service and assistance to the victims of civil disorder.

Clearly our most significant effort to date, however, has been our pilot police training project, undertaken in cooperation with the Buffalo Police Department and funded by the Ford Foundation. In this project we have sought to determine the applicability of the "critical incident" and "role-playing" techniques to this matter of helping officers discover more professional and creative means for coping with situations of civil conflict and racial violence. The "critical incident technique" was developed by U.S. Air Force psychologists during the Second World War, when it was used in gathering reports from combat veterans of behavior observed by them which was especially helpful or inadequate in accomplishing the assigned mission. The "role-playing" technique is a rather widely-used educational and training technique in which individuals are asked to assume the roles of various characters faced with a given situation with instructions to act out their assumed roles with relation to the other characters and the problem at hand.

In Buffalo, the use of the critical incident techniques has enabled us to identify a number of recurring "fuse situations." Interviews with 100 Buffalo police officers and a lesser number of minority youth have pointed up several types of calls and police procedures which could easily erupt into larger disturbances. While these situations may or may not present problems in your communities, I thought perhaps I might share one of them with you by way of illustration.

SUSPICIOUS LOITERING

Two uniformed officers patrolling in a black business/residential neighborhood after midnight detect three black youths, each carrying a box, walking toward the street from between two stores. This particular neighborhood has been the scene of repeated robberies in recent weeks and this has increased the officers' vigilance in their nightly patrols. The officers stop their car, the boys see them, and the officers yell to them to come over to the car. It is a hot summer weekend evening and many of the neighborhood residents are out on their porches, talking and relaxing.

Now in this situation several officers reported they have questioned and frisked the youth, whom they describe as most disres-

pectful and uncooperative. The officers then report putting the youth in the patrol car in lieu of further investigation. The youth for their part resent the entire police action in this situation but are particularly provoked by the policeman "going in my pocket" and "messing with my property." The youth seem to consider this act particularly offensive and indicate a disposition to physically resist at this point, explaining they have been told by their parents that no man has a right to go through pockets without a search warrant. Over and beyond this, however, the youth also report growing neighborhood sensitivity to their placement and detention in a police car for any purpose except their lawful arrest. The fuselike nature of this situation is therefore readily apparent.

Now, when it comes to role-playing this situation as part of the training workshop, members of the black community are invited to participate in acting out the situation, together with the police, thereby insuring a greater degree of realism.

Citizens and officers are asked to wear ordinary street clothes with the police hat, nightstick, gun and gunbelt being the only visible symbols of police authority. The situation is played through three times. First, the officers are asked to play the police while the citizens play the citizens. However, in the second enactment of the situation, the roles are reversed with the officers playing the citizens and the citizens playing the police. Then, in the third run-through, the officers are asked to play the roles of model citizens as the police would like them, and the citizens are asked to play the roles of model policemen as the citizens would wish them. By reversing the roles in this way, the action is not restricted to how the police and the citizens chose to depict themselves, but abruptly shifts the focus to how the citizens and the police perceive one another. For ultimately, of course, out on the street the policeman must deal with how other people perceive him or think he should act. Rarely do their perceptions match his own self-image.

One final but important component in this pilot training project is the Performance Evaluation Form on which the officers attending the workshops are asked to note those things said or done by the police and the citizens which seemed to have either a moderating or an aggravating effect on each given fuse situation.

By way of summary let me simply say that if I were asked to draw a conclusion from my own limited experience in working on these problems of police/community relations, it would undoubtedly be that each of us needs all of us more than we know. None of us—policemen, poor people, politicians, social scientists and Quakers alike—have any pat answers to some of these incredibly explosive social crises. Yet it is clear that unless we all work together—exchanging our perspectives, combining our energies and sustaining our resolve—we cannot hope to short-circuit that vicious cycle of racism—rage-fear-violence which threatens our land.

Two years ago, a New York City police officer named Bill Wetteroth opened what might otherwise have been a locked door in my life. I was a civilian—a Quaker who didn't believe in guns—a protester who had been arrested more than once for nonviolent witness against war. Yet Bill helped get me accepted as one of the first civilian graduate students at the New York College of Police Science.

Since then, I have grown a lot through times of frustration, tension and trial. Indeed there were moments when I thought it would be impossible to maintain community with both the police and my embattled, suffering brothers in Washington D.C. and Vietnam. For even as I struggled to develop my ties of friendship with each group,

I found myself risking rejection as an enemy by the other.

But somehow we made it. The police stretched, my militant friends stretched, and I stretched, and miraculously we have all managed to hold on to each other's basic humanity.

And that's really what I've wanted more than anything else to say here this morning—For God's sake, for peoples' sake, for our For God's sake, for people's sake, for our children's sake, don't anyone let go. White lies, citizens, policemen—we must all hold on . . .

THE CLASS OF 1986—WHERE IS IT GOING?

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, occasionally an individual comes along who possesses a rare insight into human nature, an insight into life and our constant struggle with ourselves and our environment. When such an individual is also blessed with the ability to express this knowledge in a clear and concise way, we are indeed fortunate.

Words from these individuals are always interesting and informative and often serve as the incentive which keeps man striving for greater things.

The words of these individuals often help show the way in a world shadowed with fear and anxiety. They show that change is possible, often even desirable; they show that the world need not be static, without change or improvement; that nothing is beyond the hope of those who have the courage to try the new, to be different, to attempt the impossible.

Such words came recently to us in a speech delivered by my very good friend and constituent, the Honorable Ollie W. Nabors, Alabama State senator, from Gadsden, Ala. Senator Nabors was addressing the Phi Kappa Educational Fraternity in Birmingham, Ala.

This speech is so timely, interesting, and informative that I feel each Member of Congress who takes time to read it, will find it a source of enlightenment.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Senator Nabors' speech in the Extension of Remarks of the RECORD. The speech follows:

THE CLASS OF 1986: WHERE IS IT GOING?

(By Senator Ollie W. Nabors)

One hundred and eight years ago, the great French acrobat Blondin announced his intent to walk across Niagara Falls on a tight-rope carrying a man on his back. Over a million people, including President Fillmore and the Prince of Wales, turned out to watch. After they were a quarter of the way across, the worried passenger urged Blondin to turn back. The Frenchman answered—in a rough translation to suit my purposes here today—"Just because you're on the top, sir, doesn't mean you know where you're going."

I mean, of course, that education has come of age in this country . . . that it is on top. Now the question is: Do we know where education is going?

You may remember the reaction of the Indian to a new lighthouse being built. After many months, when it was finished, he stood staring at it when a thick fog began to roll in. "Ugh," he said, "light shine, bell ring, horn blow—but fog come in all the same!"

There is, I think, a moral here for those of us who are concerned with the quality of education in America today. No matter how much we shine our lights, and ring our bells, and blow our horns, it is the fog that we ultimately must contend with.

And it seems to me that the first element of fog that we must get rid of is our fuzzy and much-abused notion of what constitutes "education." Perhaps the best and truest definition I have heard so far was Albert Einstein's. He said, "Education is that which remains after you have forgotten everything you learned at school."

Now, this seems to me to be more than a mere witicism at the expense of teachers and textbooks. What Einstein meant—like everything he said—was both very simple and very profound.

He meant that "education" is not a mass of inert facts or ideas, but an *attitude*, a *style*, an *appetite*, an *approach*, a *frame of mind*, a *continuing function* of the full personality.

What is an educated person? Clearly, it is not merely one who has lots of information. The World Almanac has plenty of information.

It is not merely one who can accomplish some technical, specialized job. We are turning out machines today that can do many of those jobs much better and faster (and cheaper) than any person can.

It is not merely a person who has finished a Grade-A college with high marks, and received a diploma.

In my view, we can only say we have really educated a person when he *functions* at his *full potential* as a human being in the kind of world he (not us) will be living in.

Let's then focus our imaginations on the kind of world the children of today will be graduating into. However I make my computations, a child born today will be graduating from high school in 1986. Assuming none of us want to accept George Orwell's premises about 1986, let us speculate together about the high school class of 1986 and the world they will be stepping into. As we speculate, however, let us do so with the humility this task deserves.

SPACE AGE SCIENCE

Those of us whose intellectual nourishment, not too many years ago, consisted of a substantial diet of the Sunday comics, knew that only Buck Rogers took seriously the possibility of interplanetary space vehicles. But we may have already forgotten that Buck Rogers was supposed to be operating in the 25th Century.

Today, less than ten years after the sputnik, it has become commonplace to talk about a man landing on the moon. Within twenty years, however, it is quite likely that a permanent base will have been established on the moon for ten men or so for an indefinite stay.

The moon, however, will not long appease our ravenous appetites for new worlds to conquer. Man will very likely land on the planet Mars and return in this century.

Let's get down to earth. Already, we see announcements of "jumbo" jets; drastically reducing the cost of travel, making this big, wide world available to many of our citizens who may have previously considered "abroad" as a fairyland that for them would always exist only on a classroom globe, or on a film. Only a few years away are supersonic jets that will make any place in the world not too many hours away. Past that we will see ballistic missiles that will squeeze the world into a really small round ball where distances are recorded in minutes. "One World" will become a reality at a rate that Wendell Willkie couldn't have imagined.

LIFE SCIENCE

Let's turn to the field of medicine which is probably in for the most exciting time of its life and therefore, I might add, your life.

It is almost certain this class of 1986 will

live longer, perhaps far longer, than any other generation in history.

Progress in basic understanding of the immunological barriers is very likely indeed, and with it comes the transplantation of natural organs like kidneys, hearts, livers, spleens, etc. Many of us have trouble knowing who we are in this ambiguous world. Imagine the psychological difficulties of knowing that five of your vital organs once belonged to someone else.

But even if this work fails, we can expect with confidence artificial organs made out of new materials, or electronic instruments that carry out functions formerly carried out, for example by a failing heart.

Whether these particular approaches to extending life fail or not, we can expect to see major efforts in the *Chemical* control of the aging process, with the possibility that life can someday be extended by many years.

As you contemplate the extension of the life span, I am sure your minds begin to roam over the uncertain terrain that needs to be explored . . . for example, the economic impact of such a population shift, the social impact, the change in family relationships implied, the change in business working relationships and the responsibilities suggested by any significant change in the age distribution of our population. Probably not too many of us want to contemplate cities even more clogged, confused, complex, conglomerated.

But this may be of kindergarten variety compared to another broad scientific assault on the stuff humans are made of. Whether you call it genetics or molecular engineering, it is pretty heady stuff.

Many will say this work is mischievous tampering; others will say it is sublimely holy work. But by themselves, editorial judgments of either kind will probably not significantly affect the irrepressible flow of some preliminary answers to the tantalizing question of how to create and change human beings.

Sometime, we will probably see chemical control or altering of specific personality characteristics. This will require some fascinating and enormously human decisions about what kind of person you want to be.

Still later, we may see biochemicals that modify genes, that raise the "quality" of the stuff we're made of; in short, the engineering of change of human molecules.

COMPUTER SCIENCES

Within ten years, we will see computer memories in the range of a trillion bit capacity, compared to the trifling million and billion bit capacities now.

This makes possible the development of goal oriented computers . . . called "heuristics," which is defined as "serving to find out or discover." These creatures of our own invention will in the not too distant future not only reach solutions much faster than man, but by means that might take us many lifetimes to understand.

From my discussions with experts, our class of 1986 may well in their lifetimes see what one might call high I.Q. computers . . . which can comprehend I.Q. tests and make embarrassingly high scores.

As computers grow faster and "brighter," we will also see surprising developments in storage and retrieval techniques and in voice recognition. These developments in turn may make a kind of individualized instruction possible. The student and "teacher" would be on opposite ends of an electronic log; similar in concept but, I must say, a bit different in execution from Mark Hopkins' log.

There is already another knowledge revolution brewing . . . equally heady, if I may be pardoned a pun . . . in the area above our necks where, I think we would agree, our pervasive and deep ignorance is impressive. I am referring, of course, to the brain.

As one visits with the great academic brains of our best universities, one can sense the new frontier, the new excitement. Let us

study man, these men are saying. Molecular biologists are saying they want to be human biologists. Physicists whose earlier preoccupation was the structure of things are now saying they shall become biophysicists. Psychologists long identified with rats, academically that is, are now deeply involved with children and how their earliest learning patterns are formed.

Yes, we can all speculate about the world of 1986, but as wise historians, our sober experience of the last 20 years tell us that we should not be seduced by the temptation to believe our own specific predictions. Rather, we should be humbled by the reality that nobody really knows what the leaders of the year 2000 will really need to know. Too much depends on discoveries not yet discovered. We only really know that the future which tomorrow's leaders will face will be unbelievably changed, will be enormously exciting but largely unpredictable.

What has all this got to do with education?

TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY

First, we are probably safe in saying that the whole world will be living increasingly with the implications of the Age of Science and Technology. All of us, living in these exciting times, must feel from time to time that we would like, in the words of the recent musical, to "Stop the world, I want to get off." You might have felt like the 80-year old woman who wrote as follows: "Dear Sir: Why do we have to go to the moon? Why can't we stay on this earth and watch television the way the Good Lord intended?"

Isn't it already clear that today's and certainly tomorrow's leaders, however gifted in their grasp of the humanities, will suffer some functional illiteracy if they cannot converse in at least the basic language of mathematics or the underlying physical sciences.

To quote Einstein once more: "Our age," he said, "is characterized by the perfection of means and the confusion of goals." We have the means to get almost anywhere—even to the moon—but we do not know why we want to go there, or what we want to do when we get there.

Every age has its own idols that it worships, usually in the place of a true God. Our contemporary idols, in many quarters, are Industry and Science. But, we forget that these are means, not ends. Science can provide us with medicines to save our lives, or bombs to blow us up. Industry can provide us with gadgets and gimmicks to cater to our vanity and self-centeredness, or with products that will make us more humanized and cultivated.

Industry and science, in themselves, are morally neutral tools; they have no value system in themselves. The question they ask is: "How can we do this better?" But the question we must ask ourselves, as men, is "Why should this be done at all?"

We have developed an astonishing technology—but to what end?

For example, how are we really going to decide to use an amazing technology—our satellites? Dr. Wernher von Braun, is perhaps, the world's most gifted spokesman for space technology. He has been asked why should we spend 50 to 75 billion dollars to send men to mars.

Von Braun tells us that satellites equipped with remarkable physical sensors, could survey farms, can spot diseases in crops, drought areas, forest fires, mineral resources, can even detect the best fishing conditions, and, of course, can illuminate the world with knowledge and information. But will we use satellites for these socially and constructive purposes, or will we use them only for entertainment, propaganda, and military purposes?

Science cannot decide this. Industry cannot decide this. The schools cannot decide this. Only the whole society, acting as educated individuals, can make this decision.

The humanistic implications of our technological future can be either frightening or inspiring. If we are to avoid the Orwellian kind of 1986, we need an informed citizenry, a humane citizenry, a bilingual citizenry that understands the implications of the humanities and technology.

For the sake of a humane 1986, we desperately need your help in stimulating the development, indeed the education, of this kind of full man.

What kind of a person does 1986 require?

I have not come here tonight to massage anyone's ego, or to say any of the comfortable and complacent things expected at pious ceremonies. And I conceive it my duty to tell you, as frankly and forcefully as I can, that schools are not succeeding in turning out the kind of citizens we need—which many of us already know—but further, that just getting the schools more money and more equipment and more buildings and more books, as desperately and urgently as they are needed, will not do the trick either. We cannot permit ourselves to enjoy the peculiarly American delusion that money can buy anything.

What kind of person, what kind of leader are we talking about for this Brave New World of 1986?

I wonder if you would think with me tonight about people you know whom you consider to be great contributors, indeed great leaders, in this rapidly changing world, men who seem to have achieved their human potential, who symbolize man at his best.

Now, how are they different from the rest of us?

Is it just their grades in college or the college itself? Of course not. We all know students from the same college, with the same social or cultural pedigree if you will, the same courses, the same grades . . . one is a leader, an innovator, a beautifully functioning human being. The other doesn't really make it in today's hectic world.

As you think about the differences, do you find with me that often the differences are in the area of human and personal characteristics—of attitudes, appetites, styles of attack?

Apparently, knowledge however important, is simply not enough. It is far easier to get people to absorb new knowledge than it is to get them to alter their conclusions. Most of us have an incredible talent for processing new facts in such a way that our prior conclusions remain intact. Particularly with modern educational technology, I think we will far more easily solve the problem of transmitting to students the vast information explosion than we will the crucial human styles that 1986 will require.

1. *The kind of person who has an appetite for change.*—Increasingly, the really successful leaders I see have a real appetite for the future. They welcome it. Embrace it.

They've learned how to learn. In a short time, they grasp the essentials of a new situation. They create new solutions to new problems and with gusto. Others, equally intelligent and "educated" don't do so well. They react defensively . . . "It can't be done." "It's cloud nine." "It won't work." They react historically, "We've always done it this way."

Can appetite and a style for innovation be taught in schools? Can it be simulated and stimulated? I think so. I certainly hope so. It apparently is one of the very important things that remains after we have forgotten about what we learned at school.

2. *The kind of person who senses the emerging environment.*—If you go to London—which I suppose might be called the world headquarters of the Mod revolution—you walk into Biba's, one of the most "in" shops in town, and, if I may lapse into the parlance of the psychedelic, I understand, you can't help but be "turned on." Music blaring at you about three decibels louder than you would have thought your ears

could take. Colors, sights, sensations that defy description. And this is a retail store! It isn't hard for an old-timer of forty to see why sociologists are saying that never before in the history of mankind has one generation so totally rejected, or veered away from, another.

What are these young people looking for? What are they really saying to us?

Likewise, the new politics is, on the surface, an equal puzzlement. We "old-timers" developed our own vocabulary . . . conservatives, liberals, right, left. But do these kinds of words really explain the ferment in colleges, or even the Bobby Kennedy phenomenon?

I guess that the "frantic" quality that some of our young people exhibit simply reflects the fact that there's so much—so incredibly much—happening. In fact, much of their environment is information.

The businessman, the school superintendent and the legislator can easily be isolated within his occupation, and in his own way lives in an "ivory tower," more remote from realities than many an academic person. Part of the shift we need from the "specialist" to the "generalist" is getting our leaders and citizens to "crosspollinate" as it were, with the cultural community, the academic community, the nonsuburban community, the young community, the scientific community, the world community.

Here, time is our enemy. More and more of our working time is spent in monumental trivialities which bear only the dimmest relationship to the work that we are really paid to do. By the time we extricate ourselves from these irrelevancies and get down to the business at hand, we are commonly too tired to cross pollinate with anyone at all!

Let us assume our 1986 graduate senses the outside world. But what if he is familiar with the outside world but a stranger to his own feelings, uncomfortable with his inner-self, uncommunicative with his fellow man?

I don't know whether there is some kind of perverse, or inverse law or what, but as technology and urbanization move us into closer and closer physical proximity, we seem to become more and more emotionally distant.

In short, can a graduate not "humanized" be said to be educated?

Can you help the society of 1986 by helping create the kinds of people who are good environmental sensors, good human sensors, good cross pollinators, good listeners, aware people?

Clearly, there are not enough psychiatrists or enough professionals to "educate" students to their own and others' humanity.

But, aren't there powerful new group dynamics techniques where students could help each other learn to "know thyself" and others?

I think so. And I certainly hope so.

3. *The kind of person who is a great citizen.*—There is much talk these days about the Great Society. I submit the obvious to you. The Great Society requires Great Citizens.

Once again, I urge you to think of people you have known. Occasionally, we see a great citizen; somehow, he has learned to care, to be compassionate, to want to serve others.

When Professor Irwin Edman was teaching at Columbia, he used to tell his philosophy students: "There are two kinds of people in the world—those who divide the world into two kinds of people, and those who don't."

His playful little paradox is no longer so playful. We can no longer afford to divide the world into two kinds of people—into us and them. Instead, to use Martin Buber's terms, we must begin to think, and act, on a person-to-person basis of I—and thou. The rest of the world are not outsiders any longer; we are all in the same boat on a

stormy sea, and the man who drills a hole under his seat can sink the whole boat and all its passengers.

What can schools do to help to create the sense of commitment, the sense of caring for the other citizens of the world?

The civics course can provide models. But what new teaching approaches, new learning experience (for example, perhaps indeed a junior and part-time domestic Peace Corps) are needed to make citizenship part of what remains after the graduate has forgotten what he learned in school.

At this point, you may be saying, yes, I agree, and always have, the world of 1986 needs and deserves a human being with some new styles, new appetites, new dimensions.

Yet, it seems clear to me, even though the fog—that the basic system of rewards and punishments we have in our schools does not particularly encourage those traits and tendencies I think we would all agree will be increasingly important in the future.

For the world of the future—and the very near future—will call for such traits as *originality*, *boldness*, and *flexibility*. Whereas, I wonder if many of our schools don't unconsciously encourage *conformity*, *timidity*, and *rigidity*. Often, what the school wants out of the student is the "right answer"—forgetting that often the right answer is the *rite* answer.

Schools sometimes behave as if they want pupils who sit quietly and listen to the teacher droning away—which reminds me of Mortimer Adler's famous definition of formal education as "a process by which material passes from the notebook of the teacher to the notebook of the pupil, without passing through the head of either."

The kind of mechanized, mass indoctrination of the "right answer" might have worked a few generations ago—although it was never a very good kind of education—but today it is fatal, both to the students and to the society they will have to build.

We may agree on the specifications of the superior human being we need, but they remain useless platitudes as long as the measuring sticks we continue to use in the schools are calibrated for other uses. If we reward children for learning the techniques of reading, writing, and counting, and provide no incentives for the deeper know-how, the deeper styles of life, then they will often leave school lacking the broader perspectives and the wider skills that are needed to live successfully and fruitfully.

We can measure the raw skills they possess, but the raw skills tell us no more about their total effectiveness than the number of pistons in an automobile tells us how well it will run or hold together in a race.

The kinds of tests that teachers give—since these determine their grades—influence the attitudes of pupils much more than what the teacher says about the need broad-gauged, creative, committed citizens. And if the emphasis in class remains on learning facts by rote and being quiet and not asking troublesome questions and writing in a neat hand—then all the noble speeches are made in vain. Pupils, and parents, respond to reward and penalty; and if the youngster is simply trying to get through his College Boards by marking the "right" answers, without knowing or caring what they mean, then it is extremely hard to change his later motivation and style.

For, in a real sense, our young people have to become pioneers again. Not pioneers, as their ancestors were, in the forest primeval; but, even harder, pioneers in the technological jungle, where no one really knows what tomorrow will bring, where developments are so rapid, and changes so cataclysmic, that only the sharpest and most sensitive will survive and flourish.

To these imminent problems, there are no answers in the back of the book. The only answers must come from the back of the head.

There may well be some who would say that the development of this new kind of person is more appropriately the function of the family, and/or the culture, and/or the church, and so forth. Still others might insist that schools should focus their energies on more "formal" education, on more "academic" matters.

I would urge us not to worry about jurisdictional definitions or disputes. The task is so important that overlapping and reinforcement will indeed be needed and extremely desirable. But if the school, which is the one institution that has access to all children during their very formative years does not consider the development of this kind of person a vital part of its charter in a new age, then we will not be utilizing what is probably the single most important channel for change in our entire society.

Can education help give our new generations genuine self-confidence, genuine courage, and, at the same time, teach them that they must *themselves* discover the new truths?

Can education, through a better concept of teaching durable disciplines and transferable skills, help create people who are equipped to shift comfortably from one challenge to another—who can rationally manage one set of unpredictables after another?

Can education help suppress the development of defense mechanisms which prevent most of us from seeing the world as it really exists?

Can the educational environment in fact help provide the emotional security which enables one to recognize that life is indeed filled with risks and ambiguities, and that the great human achievement is to deal with them creatively and joyfully rather than to be blind to change, or even worse, fearful of change.

Can education broaden its mission to include the development of the total human being, to help him achieve his total human potential, the full humanhood 1986 will require?

In short, we can't presume to describe precisely the specifications of the "job" which needs to be done by tomorrow's leaders. But precisely in our inability to describe the job, I think we accurately describe the kind of men and women we need.

HAROLD REA: HALSTEAD, KANS.,
EDITOR

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in Kansas we are very proud of the many outstanding weekly newspapers which contribute so much to the communities they serve. The moving force behind these community newspapers are the hard-working and dedicated editors. Last week one of these distinguished newspapermen, Harold Rea, editor and publisher of the Halstead, Kans., Independent, passed away at age 53.

He had kept his usual morning business hours at the newspaper office and was stricken soon after going home for lunch.

Harold Rea had varied interests ranging from the Lions Club to the lay advisory board of the Halstead Hospital, to the Halstead Art Association, to sports and politics. Each year he arranged for me to make a report on Washington and congressional activities before the Halstead Lions Club.

Mr. Rea had published the Halstead Independent since March 1, 1951. Prior to that he had worked on Kansas papers at Stockton, Glen Elder, Lyons, Topeka, and Newton.

The community of Halstead, the State of Kansas, and our Nation have lost a devoted American and a fine journalist in the passing of Harold Rea. Mrs. Shriver and I extend to Mrs. Rea and her sons, Roger and James, and daughters, Ruth and Amy, our heartfelt sympathy.

A DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of Members of the House a recent feature story on Noah J. Williams which appeared in the Saginaw News on June 19, 1968. I read the article with particular interest since it has been my privilege to know Mr. Williams for a great number of years. He truly is a distinguished citizen in our Saginaw community.

There is no question that racial relations have and continue to improve in our community. There is still much to be accomplished but because of the dedicated work of Mr. Williams and thousands of other Saginaw citizens—black and white—there will be continued progress.

The news article, capably written by Mr. Edward W. Miller, follows:

NOTES PROGRESS HERE IN RACE RELATIONS

(By Ed Miller)

Noah J. Williams, 909 N. 5th, has spent 40 of his 70 years in Saginaw. His 70th birthday anniversary was Monday.

For many years he has been an audible voice in the Negro community. For six years he was president of Saginaw Chapter of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People. He was one of the organizers of its Michigan Branch and served as vice president.

"I think we are getting somewhere with racial relations here in Saginaw," he said. "Yes, I think we have made wonderful progress here. It was not many years ago that a Negro seemed only able to work in a foundry or in domestic work."

"Now you find Negroes have positions—not just jobs—in many walks of life. You find them in government, in banks, in stores, working for utilities and the like. They don't just do janitor work in those places. Now they have positions."

But he thinks there is more ground to be gained, and that it will be gained, and these are among his theories:

"I would say we need to keep working constantly together for better understanding. We must have more contacts together and that will improve our understanding of mutual problems."

Noah was born June 17, 1898, in Morris County, Texas, a son of the Rev. and Mrs. W. J. Williams. They had five sons and five daughters. All but two attended college.

Noah was graduated in 1924 from Booker T. Washington High School, Wichita Falls, Texas. There he organized the Booker T. Washington Athletic Club and Young Men's Progressive Club. He was president of both.

For six months he was in the Tuskegee Institute Reserve Officers Training Corps,

then attended Moorhouse College in Atlanta, Ga., for two years. He studied theology.

Since his arrival in Saginaw in 1928, he has been active in affairs of Zion Baptist Church, has taught Bible class there and helped organize the Christ Community Church here.

In 1947 he organized the Saginaw Valley Interracial Committee and has served as president. He also is president of the East Side Men's Republican Club which he organized.

As chairman of the Saginaw Valley Interracial Committee, aimed at achieving a better understanding between all races, he spent three months touring Europe and Africa.

Many of Saginaw's leading business men, as well as Negroes, contributed toward a \$750 fund which made his trip possible, he recalls with pride.

"Yes," Noah said, musing a moment. "I still think there is hope for our world. But I think we have to talk more with Him up there. I think we must be more consistent with our worship and religious activities."

PENNSYLVANIA PETITIONERS BACK POOR PEOPLE'S GOALS

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, despite the unpleasant circumstances of its conclusion, the Poor People's Campaign served a critically important purpose by calling attention to the fact that nearly 30 million Americans live in conditions of poverty and possibly 10 million men, women, and children are victimized by hunger, malnutrition, and even slow starvation.

I am sure that the Poor People's Campaign stirred the conscience of many Americans and may possibly serve to advance the Emergency Employment and Training Act of 1968, which I introduced and which has been the subject of recent hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty.

In connection with the question of legislation, one of the continuing products of the Poor People's Campaign will be the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Poor People's Campaign, headed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. I am glad to serve on that committee.

Following a meeting we had with representatives of the Department of Justice and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Senator BROOKE announced for our committee that its work will persevere and said:

We intend to continue striving for effective legislative and administrative action to end hunger in America, to provide decent housing for all our people, to create jobs for all those willing and able to work, to end the deprivation of those whose disabilities make them unable to support themselves.

I am glad to report that the ad hoc committee will have the continued backing of a number of active Pennsylvania organizations. One of these is the Delaware County Poor People's Campaign Support Committee, which last week presented to me a petition signed by nearly 3,000 Pennsylvanians. In one concise and

comprehensive sentence these concerned citizens told Congress:

We urge the Members of the Congress to take extraordinary action to implement the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and to take steps to achieve the objectives of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in providing jobs and income, decent housing, and good schools for all Americans.

A letter signed by four members of the support committee accompanied the petition. Because it reveals interesting aspects on how the petition was circulated—and the reception it received—I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DELAWARE COUNTY POOR PEOPLES CAMPAIGN SUPPORT COMMITTEES,

Swarthmore, Pa., June 19, 1968.

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: On behalf of the Delaware County Poor Peoples Campaign Support Committees, we present to you this petition, signed by nearly 3,000 of your constituents in Delaware County, and many in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This petition urges the members of the Congress to take extraordinary action to implement the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, and to take steps to achieve the objectives of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in providing jobs and income, decent housing, and good schools for all Americans.

The people who have worked on this committee are all busy working people who have had only their spare time to give; nevertheless they have been surprised and immensely pleased at the enthusiastic reception this petition has had whenever it has been taken into their neighborhoods, meetings of organizations and churches, and in shopping centers. For instance, at an eighth grade mother's meeting in Swarthmore, we had only two refusals. Mr. Harrison Wright canvassed the faculty of Swarthmore College, and got over 90% of their signatures.

We hope that this petition will help to strengthen your position in working for good legislation.

Very sincerely yours,
ERNEST FULLER,

Chairman.

Mrs. PHILIP J. THORSON,
Mrs. NICHOLAS MUEHLBERG,
BARBARA JOHNSON.

TV VIOLENCE NOTED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been provided with a copy of an article by Communications Editor Richard L. Tobin on the subject of television violence. It appeared in the June 8 issue of Saturday Review and is so startling I would like to bring at least part of it to public attention. I insert a portion of the Tobin article in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

TV VIOLENCE NOTED

In the course of an eight-hour exposure to ABC, CBS, and NBC, as well as half a dozen

local outlets, we marked down ninety-three specific incidents involving sadistic brutality, murder, cold-blooded killing, sexual cruelty, and related sadism so much in the vogue on mass media nowadays. Naturally, even news programs were full of such material because they covered violent acts inherent in Vietnam and U.S. ghettos.

In the course of this eight-hour vista (and if you want to give up TV for a while we recommend a prolonged stretch of Westerns, gangster drama, situation "comedy," and unintelligible courtroom drama), we encountered seven different kinds of pistols and revolvers, three varieties of rifle, three distinct brands of shotgun, half a dozen assorted daggers and stilettos, two types of machete, one butcher's cleaver, a broadaxe, rapiers galore, an ancient broadsword, a posse of sabers, an electric prod, and a guillotine. Men (and women and even children) were shot by gunpowder, burned at the stake, tortured over live coals, trussed and beaten in relays, dropped into molten sugar, cut to ribbons (in color), repeatedly kned in the groin, beaten while being held defenseless by other hoodlums, forcibly drowned, whipped with a leather belt, and dealt with in many other ways before our very eyes—and the eyes of the hundreds of thousands of children who must have been watching some part of what we saw. By the end of the stint we were quite insensitive, almost immune to the shock of seeing a human being in pain. It had ceased to mean much to us that most of the weapons of mayhem, cruelty, and homicide were available in the nearest town or through the local post office. The patent connection with recent headlines was not lost upon us.

President Kennedy and Dr. King are by no means the only victims of Violent America and TV and the sellers of lethal weapons by no means the only villains. Ours have always been frontier people, and the use of guns and violence part of our tradition, though not necessarily the finest part. But when brutality on the hour every hour combines chemically with the available gun and knife, and when we become sated in every part of our mass media with casual cruelty, pain, even murder, in the last third of the twentieth century, the place we live in and the people we are becoming have to frighten us, even the most insensitive, when we look into the gory mirror and see ourselves as we really are.

ENFORCEMENT KEY TO FIREARMS LAWS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in these past weeks we have all felt the impact of the emotional appeals being made for or against gun-control legislation. However, an article in the June 21 issue of the Phoenix Gazette, articulately written by columnist DeWayne Smith, takes a reasoned and unemotional look at both the merits of the gun-control question and at the reaction of the public to that question. Because I think it so important that gun-control proposals be evaluated coolly and fully, I am including Mr. Smith's article, entitled "Enforcement Key to Firearms Laws," and I recommend it as required reading for all those who will be asked to cast a vote on gun control:

ENFORCEMENT KEY TO FIREARMS LAWS

If past performance means anything, Congress might just as well forget about the new firearms legislation it has passed and is expected to pass.

The Federal law enforcement agencies have treated existing firearms controls as step children and have admitted, under questioning by Congressmen at a 1965 hearing, that they are unable to enforce firearms laws due to a lack of manpower.

And all the time they are crying for more controls, obviously to make their jobs easier.

The lack of enforcement came to light last January when a United States attorney successfully obtained a federal grand jury indictment against a New York state firearms dealer for shipping guns to individuals in other states who had not produced the required state or local licenses or permits.

The Federal Firearms Act of 1938 spells out this mail order abuse in its provisions, and it took the justice department 30 years to enforce the law hard enough to get an indictment.

It appears that there could be a lot more done on the part of our Federal law enforcement groups to enforce the existing laws.

NEW BILL SIGNED

The bill that President Johnson signed on Wednesday prohibiting interstate mail-order sales of handguns and also their over-the-counter sale to nonresidents of a state and to people under 21 certainly doesn't prohibit firearms from the law abiding public.

And frankly I'm getting a little tired of reading letters to the editor written by people who emotionally denounce Congress and others for wanting to take their guns away from them.

To take guns away is not the question. It may be the point of debate someday, but at this point it is not.

BAD GUN ADVERTISING

Gun advertising with the theme, "Protect Your Right to Keep and Bear Arms" is nothing more than a cheap, emotional appeal. To the uninformed it sounds like the government is coming around tomorrow to pick up all firearms.

The ban on mail-order sales of handguns is now the law of the land and should be obeyed no matter how much one disagrees with it. Frankly I don't feel this will hamper the law abiding public very much if they want to purchase a handgun for either home protection or sporting purposes.

EMOTIONAL APPEALS

The emotional appeals on both sides of the gun question are getting a little tough to swallow. It's time for both factions to sit down and hash the problem over and come up with a workable solution.

The murder of three of our country's leaders during the last five years points even more to the fact that the lawless element in our society has grown and become more brazen.

Haphazard gun control laws are not going to solve the problem and gun owners should realize that firearms are too easily obtained by undesirables.

COWBOYS, INDIANS

Firearms and sheer determination founded this country and guns have been an integral part of America ever since. Most children have toy guns and worship gun-toting heroes on television and in the movies.

As long as we have what we call a free and open society, firearms will be in evidence. And as long as they are in the hands of human beings, they will from time to time be used for something other than what they are intended.

Naturally I'm not condoning misuse of firearms. But as long as we have the free society of which we are so proud, we'll have such problems.

ARNOLD KOHN HONORED BY OPTOMETRY

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in New York State we are fortunate in having in our midst a very distinguished gentleman and attorney at law, Harold Kohn, Esq. who is this week being honored for 34 years as general counsel of the American Optometric Association.

In 1923 Harold Kohn, then a young attorney, was retained by the "Optometrical"—as the word was used in those days—Society of the City of New York. That retainer was the beginning of a lifetime of association with the optometric profession and Mr. Kohn's career, as indeed his very life, has ever since been intertwined with the emergence of optometry as a fully fledged health profession. In 1925 the Brooklyn Optometric Society looked at what their colleagues across the East River were doing and also decided to retain the services of the young attorney. Five years later the New York State Optometric Association likewise sought Mr. Kohn's services. Evidently Mr. Kohn must have been doing something right during those years for his prowess reached the ears of the national optometric body and in 1934 he was retained as general counsel to the American Optometric Association. For all of the intervening years he has maintained his close contacts with optometry and today Mr. Harold Kohn is unquestionably the country's leading authority on the legal aspects of optometry in all 50 States.

Now, at the age of 74, Mr. Kohn is relinquishing his position as general counsel of the American Optometric Association and optometrists from around the Nation, as well as from other countries, will honor him upon the occasion of the 71st Annual Congress of the American Optometric Association in Miami, June 26-29. Indeed the entire Congress has been dedicated to Mr. Kohn.

Harold Kohn has been the recipient of innumerable honors and awards. In 1956 the New York State Optometric Association presented him with the Frederic A. Woll Memorial Award—the highest honor bestowed by that State association, and this was the first time the award had ever been presented to a nonoptometrist. In 1959 the Massachusetts College of Optometry awarded Mr. Kohn an honorary degree of doctor of optical science, and just 3 weeks ago, on June 8, in Memphis, Tenn., the Southern College of Optometry presented Mr. Kohn with a similar honorary degree of doctor of optical science. Pennsylvania has also paid homage to Harold Kohn, for in 1964 he received from the Alumnae Association of the Pennsylvania College of Optometry a plaque in grateful recognition of his many contributions to the profession. Numerous State optometric associations have awarded Mr. Kohn honorary membership in their ranks, and this week, during the course of the Congress of the American Optometric Association, Mr. Kohn will be awarded

an honorary membership in that professional body.

It was my privilege to enjoy for a number of years a rather close working association with Mr. Kohn and I can vouch that Harold Kohn's outlook, his humanity, his concern for social justice, his genial manner, his never failing courtesy—whether it be to friend or opponent—all these warm human qualities are in full measure of the necessary degree to have earned him the high esteem, respect, and affection in which he is held not only by the Nation's optometrists, but also by those of us outside the profession of optometry who have been privileged to know him and to cherish his friendship.

CRIME AND TELEVISION

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the FBI reported that serious crime in the Nation for the first 3 months of this year rose 17 percent over the same period of 1967. In relating this it must be remembered that in the same period last year, crime rose 20 percent over 1966.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover called attention to the continued increases in crimes of violence, pointing out robbery, which he said is considered by many to be the bellwether of crime.

Mr. Speaker, in attacking this increasing problem, I feel that it is essential that we explore every avenue to discover the causes of this sharp rise in crime and to search for solutions that will restore law and order to our great country.

In 1962, the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee made a study of the role of television in influencing the behavior of children. There is much evidence in their study to indicate that the television networks have helped to spread violence in this country. This may well have contributed to the recent waves of violence that have swept our country.

Television's impact on all aspects of American life has been a very significant one and its influence is likely to grow. It has become a major factor in molding the character, attitudes, and behavior patterns of all Americans. It has contributed much of lasting value to the well-being of the Nation and I have no doubt that it will continue to do so.

However, sex, fear, prejudice, crime, and violence are a major part of the diet that television viewers get every day. It is estimated that the average child between the ages of 5 and 15 watches violent destruction of 13,400 persons on TV. It is difficult to believe that this heavy daily dosage of antisocial behavior does not have some effect on its viewers and on the rising incidence of lawlessness and violence that has been sweeping our country during the past few years.

I do not, in any, want to indicate that television is wholly responsible for this increase in violence and lawlessness. However, I do feel that it is the responsi-

bility of the Congress in the interest of the people it represents to find out just how extensive the incidence of violence are on television and exactly what effect they are having on our society. If we are to adequately deal with this problem we must have all the facts.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we may better understand the problem that is created by this violence on television, I am introducing legislation to establish a special committee of the Congress to conduct an investigation of the relation between the display of violence in television programs and crime in the United States. There is a great need for the Congress to gain a better understanding of this problem before it acts. And, I feel that recent events indicate that the Congress must act.

GUN CONTROL

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Pearce S. Grove, library director at Eastern New Mexico University of New Mexico, Portales, N. Mex., has requested that I insert the accompanying editorials from the Portales News-Tribune into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In complying with my constituent's request, I would like to make it clear that I am not endorsing the contents of the editorials, although I have the greatest respect and admiration for Mr. Gordon Greaves, the editor of the Portales News-Tribune.

The editorials follow:

GUNS AND JUSTICE

This country has nurtured the fiction that Americans have depended upon the guns in the closet for their rights.

This isn't true, and rarely ever was true. Men simply can't be productive if they have to be constantly on the alert to shoot down the rascals among them.

Our country is founded upon the respect for law and order, and we delegate to our policemen the business of capturing dangerous men. Rarely has it been necessary to organize a posse for this purpose. In this day and time with networks of police communications, radio patrol cars, and organization, there should seldom be any need for a man to own a gun for self protection. Far more innocent people are killed by the guns that they keep for protection than felons who are the justification of such weapons.

So we can't understand, on the theory that the right to own a gun is infringed if we require that gun to be registered, why we don't require everyone to register all his guns, simply to provide a means by which criminals may be more easily traced.

We register our automobiles, and our radio transmitters, and use them only under clearly defined rules. Is there anything more basic to the right to own a gun than an automobile?

We acknowledge that registration of guns wouldn't likely cut down on crime by any notable amount. But it would simplify the job of police in tracing the origin of murder weapons, just as it did in the case of the assassination of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. It is possible now for gun serial numbers to be

computerized on national networks so that any gun can be identified within minutes after its number is put into the network.

We have great respect for those who own guns for sporting purposes, and for those who are members of the National Rifle Association. But we don't think that their right to own and use guns would be infringed upon by a tight gun registration law, both state and national.

Those who quote the Second amendment to the U.S. constitution as justification against requirements of registrations of weapons don't read all of the amendment. It says:

"A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

That amendment was adopted at a time when the fledgling nation distrusted the idea of a standing army, and counted on men to spring to the defense of their country with their long rifles when danger came. This type of defense has never worked in America. We have never been able to rely on arms kept behind the kitchen door to meet a national challenge.

So it is time that we faced up to the realities of 20th century living, in which millions of unregistered pistols, sawed off shotguns, rifles and even bazookas are readily available to any criminal.

We ought to reserve the fiction of personally enforced justice with a gun as a relic for the late-late TV shows.

GUN CONTROL AGAIN

Americans who cherish the idea that the gun in the closet is a peculiarly American right, owe it to themselves to look at the facts.

The statistics have been available all along, but have received attention only since the murder of Sen. Robert Kennedy.

President Johnson quoted these figures in his appeal to the nation a week ago, but they bear repeating:

Each year in the United States guns are involved in more than 6,500 murders. This compares to 30 in England, 99 in Canada, 68 in West Germany and 37 in Japan.

And if that figure doesn't shake you, consider that in addition to murders, guns were responsible in 1966 for 10,000 suicides and 2,600 accidental deaths in the U.S.

The most startling figure of all is that more Americans have died from privately owned guns since 1900 than from all the wars that have ever been fought by the United States.

Americans need to grow up in their attitude about firearms, and concede that when it comes to protection, a gun in the home is of questionable value. For every gun owned by a person who knows how to use it effectively without danger to innocent people, there are scores laying about the house within reach of immature persons who have had no training in the use of a weapon.

But the idea persists, through our Western folklore, that a man riding into town with a gun slung from his belt, can resolve perplexing problems. This wasn't true even in the Old West. The first act of responsible law enforcement in raw plains towns like Portales was to require persons coming into town to leave their guns with the sheriff.

Then what type of gun control law does this nation need to take this step toward civilized conduct?

Consider the assassins of the three Americans whose deaths have raised this issue.

One was an ex-Marine who received a discharge under other than honorable conditions. Another was an escaped convict, who had been convicted of armed robbery. The third was an alien.

Certainly as a minimum we should expect that gun control laws should prevent these

three types from possession of any sort of firearm.

In the case of the assassin of President Kennedy the rifle with telescopic sight was ordered by mail and delivered to a fictitious name with no questions asked. Certainly it is not too much to expect that better control of the sale of firearms should be expected. It isn't clear that better control of the sale of firearms should be expected. It isn't clear how James Ray, the escaped convict obtained the Remington 30.06. He was a felon who would have been subject to arrest with or without a gun, and possession of a gun would have made him liable to further prosecution, so his case is perhaps not pertinent to the current discussion.

But the 8-shot Iver Johnson revolver used by Sirhan Sirhan was originally registered, and was quickly traced through three owners. The question in this case is whether anyone should be permitted to own a gun of this type. If so, it would appear prudent to require to have them list their possession of the gun with the local police and not to be permitted to sell it without knowledge of the police.

What type of gun control law would reduce the carnage in America?

Great Britain does not permit anyone under 14 to buy or possess any kind of gun. Handgun permits are issued almost exclusively for use on the pistol range. Sportsmen have little difficulty in securing licenses for use of shotguns, and 4500 shooting clubs flourish in the British Isles.

The National Observer sister publication of the Wall Street Journal notes that "In Britain, the homicide rate per 100,000 persons runs one-eighth the rate in the U.S.; the rate for robbery one-tenth the U.S. rate; and the rate for aggravated assault one-seventeenth."

When 5,126 Americans were being murdered by firearms in 1963, only 24 Britons were dying by the same means.

The Observer points out that the murder of 3 British policemen recently received worldwide attention, and resulted in a six-year sentence for the man who four months before the murder sold the pistols to the murderers. In the same year more than 100 policemen in the U.S. were murdered by firearms and occasioned little attention.

The National Observer makes a comparison within the U.S. that should answer some of the critics of gun control law.

New York has the most stringent gun control laws in the nation. The Sullivan Law requires citizens to obtain licenses to possess handguns even in their homes or places of business.

And New York's homicide rate is lowest in the nation—4.8 per 100,000. The rate is one-third that of Houston, Texas.

AVENUES OF EDUCATION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Federal Government closed Resurrection City and jailed hundreds of demonstrators. Today, the House may close avenues of education for millions of underprivileged youngsters and condemn them to a life far below their capabilities. If we must choose between these two examples of shortsightedness, how much worse it is to close the doors on tomorrow's citizens.

Even without the cuts made by the Appropriations Committee on the educa-

tion budget, the funds proposed for these programs in fiscal year 1969 were far from satisfactory. In many instances these were less than the expenditures for similar programs last year. As education costs and pupil loads continue to rise, we cannot afford to move backward. My State, for example, would receive, under this bill, nearly \$12 million less under title I for aid to poor schoolchildren next year. Total public elementary and secondary school enrollment in New York increased by 75,000 children this year, many of whom need the special programs aided by title I.

A Congress which can vote some \$70 billion for defense can certainly appropriate an additional \$369 million for the education of its children, who must rank as the country's greatest asset.

Even if the appropriations in this bill were adequate, I would still oppose H.R. 18037 because of two destructive and perhaps unconstitutional sections, numbers 409 and 410. These provisions would nurture segregated school facilities, in violation of several Supreme Court decisions. Furthermore, they would prohibit the withholding of Federal education funds from any State, school district, or school practicing discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. This body denies its most fundamental responsibilities if it seriously considers such provisions.

The entire Nation, but especially the poor people of this country, will look upon our action on this bill as an indication of this Government's willingness to confront and resolve the educational problems we face.

Let us tell the poor we have heard their message, understand it, and mean to act in a responsible and constructive way. Let us tell them, finally, with our vote today, that we are ready to start now.

GUN CONTROL LAWS

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, because so many discuss legislative proposals in terms of polls of public opinion, the Members will be interested in a letter just received from Mr. Larry Gillihan, assistant manager of radio station KTMN, Trumann, Ark.

Mr. Gillihan, under date of June 18, writes:

I strongly urge you to vote against the gun control bills, S. 3604, S. 3605, and H.R. 17735, and to oppose any other gun control legislation.

During a program on our station recently, I asked for opinions on gun control laws. Opinions ran about ten to one against gun controls. I talked to each caller personally, to be sure each person made only one call.

Let me emphasize that I am not writing this letter as a representative of this radio station. I am using our letterhead merely to assure you that I am associated with a radio station and that we, in fact, did run the above-mentioned program.

Your vote against, and opposition to, these bills will be deeply appreciated.

CXIV—1197—Part 14

FOREIGN AID

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, an advertisement containing an attack on the foreign aid program entitled "No Wonder We're Broke" has caused some comment lately. The purpose of the ad is to shock the American people into opposing foreign aid by flashing before them a lot of aggregate figures which are supposed to represent foreign aid totals since 1945. Without proper explanation these figures are meaningless and dangerously misleading. It is not surprising that there has been a negative reaction to this tactic and that many people are indignant at such an obvious attempt to dupe them into opposing the program.

The figures used in the article were taken from an annual report which the Agency for International Development prepares for the House Foreign Affairs Committee. What are presented as outright aid expenditures are actually far more than AID totals. They include military assistance, Public Law 480, long-term Export-Import Bank loans, the Peace Corps, disaster relief, and a variety of postwar emergency programs, totaling in all some 45 U.S. programs and activities overseas.

The Memphis Commercial Appeal commented on the advertisement on two occasions, and I would like to include in the RECORD articles from its May 19 and May 21 issues:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, May 19, 1968]

FACTS SHOW FOREIGN AID INCLUDES LARGE AMOUNT IN LOANS

WASHINGTON, May 16.—Facts and figures fly in all directions during major legislative battles in Washington.

Both sides try to make points by citing figures that purport to prove their case beyond all reasonable doubt.

But often the figures are not all-revealing. As a Frenchman said of bikinis: "What they reveal is interesting, but what they conceal is essential."

A case in point is a table of figures being used in advertisements circulated by several organizations in an attack on the foreign aid program.

Headed "No Wonder We're Broke," the table purports to show country-by-country the United States' loans and gifts to the other nations of the world, 1945-66. The total given is \$122,358,500,000.

The table is attributed to the Agency for International Development, but inquiries at AID produce a somewhat different story than that which the table's bare figures tell.

For example, the table does not show that of the 122.4 billions, a total of 35.8 billions was in loans, and that as of the June 30, 1966, date of the table, 13.5 billions had been repaid in principal and interest on the loans. By June 30, 1967, the repayments in principal and interest had mounted to 15.1 billions.

The table uses figures which AID supplied in a special report to the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year. But as often happens in the heat of argument, it ignores other figures which would detract from the point it undertakes to make.

"What has it all accomplished?" the ads ask.

To this AID replies:

"Five billions were for the immediate humanitarian relief of tens of millions of peo-

ple in Europe and Japan who were without food, clothing, jobs and, often, homes after World War II.

"Forty-four billions were invested in the economic recovery and military strengthening of Western Europe and Japan—countries which today join us in aiding development in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

"Sixteen billions were invested in military aid to build a defensive shield along the Sino-Soviet border in Asia, from Korea to Turkey.

"Four and six-tenths billions were invested in military and economic aid to embattled South Vietnam.

AID's rebuttal points out that the United States foreign aid program is not nearly as generous on a percentage basis today as it was immediately after World War II.

"In 1949, when the Marshall Plan began, United States economic aid to the war ravaged nations of Western Europe amounted to 2.78 per cent of the United States gross national product. In fiscal year 1969, United States economic aid will be about three-fifths of one per cent of the nation's gross national product."

Today, with American aid going to the less developed nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the United States is not "going it alone" as it did immediately after World War II.

"Eighteen other free world countries now share the burden of aid with the United States, some of which give a larger share of their wealth as aid than we do," AID points out.

"Today's economic aid program gives priority attention to helping the poorer countries solve the twin problems of low food production and rapidly growing population."

The ad invites the reader to scan the list of nations that have received American aid "and see how many dependable friends you can find."

To this AID replies:

"The objective of these overseas loans and grants has never been to win 'friends.' Its purpose is to help create the conditions for peace. In the words of President Johnson:

"The dividends from that investment are lives saved and schools opened and hunger relieved. But they are more. The ultimate triumphs of foreign aid are victories of prevention. They are the shots that did not sound, the blood that did not spill, the treasure that did not have to be spent to stamp out spreading flames of violence. They are not victories of war—but over wars that did not start."

Of the 122.4 billions cited in the circular 86.6 billions was for economic assistance and 35.8 billions was for military aid.

Of the economic aid 9.4 billions was export-import Bank loans aimed at providing capital for purchases in the United States and of this, 6.3 billions have been repaid. Also included is more than one billion dollars for the Peace Corps.

The economic aid total also included 14.7 billions under Public Law 480 and later Food for Peace programs. Almost all of this is surplus American farm commodities shipped abroad under various agreements and circumstances, including sales for foreign currencies and nearly one billion in dollar credits.

The ad lists 9.4 billion dollars in gifts and loans to France from 1945-66. The AID report from which the 9.4 billion figure is taken contains additional details not used in the ad.

For instance, it shows that 1.9 billions of the 9.4 billions was in loans and that principal and interest payments on these loans have amounted to 2.3 billion or 402 millions more than the original value of the loans.

The remaining 7.4 billions to France was in the form of grants. Of this 4.2 billions was for military assistance. A substantial part of this was to assist the French in fighting the Viet Minh in Vietnam, a war that preceded the current American effort in the same area. The bulk of the grants was to support France in the North Atlantic Treaty Or-

ganization (NATO), the alliance the United States helped create after World War II to protect Western Europe from a Communist takeover.

There was 3.2 billions in grants to France for economic assistance. Practically all of this was emergency assistance in the years following World War II. A total of 2.5 billions was given under the Marshall Plan, another half-billion under the Mutual Security Act from 1953-57.

Economic assistance loans to France include 1.2 billions in Export-Import Bank loans. Principal and interest payments on these loans have amounted to 1.6 billions, or 421 millions in excess of the loan values.

In respect to the ad being reprinted, another case in point is Mexico. The ad lists gifts and loans to Mexico in the amount of 1.07 billions, 1945-66.

The ad neglects to point out that:

Nearly 100 million dollars of this was in grants to help eradicate foot-and-mouth disease in Mexican cattle so that it would not be transmitted across the border and infect herds in Texas and other Southwestern states.

Nearly 800 million was in Export-Import Bank loans to generate capital for purchases in the United States and that principal and interest payments on these loans have amounted to 491 millions.

More than 71 millions was accounted for by Food for Peace transactions including 50 million dollars worth of surplus American farm commodities given to American voluntary relief agencies and distributed to needy persons in Mexico at intervals since 1953.

Of the overall total of 1.07 billions listed for Mexico, 899.7 millions was in loans and only 168.5 millions in grants. The grants included the funds to fight foot-and-mouth disease as well as some Food for Peace outlays.

Behind the total amounts listed in the Warner and Swasey ad for other countries are figures and explanations equally revealing to those for France and Mexico.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, May 21, 1968]

WHAT WE GAVE AND GOT

Mass circulation of an attack on American foreign aid through an advertisement headed, "No Wonder We're Broke," led to some digging for facts by The Commercial Appeal's Washington Bureau.

What the advertisement suggested was that the United States has given away or "loaned" more than 122 billion dollars since World War II ended without winning dependable friends or accomplishing anything but a drain on the dollar.

What we found, upon investigation, was another story.

Item: Of the 122 billion dollars, 35.8 billion was indeed loaned, and of that 35.8 billion the United States had received more than 15 billion in repayments of principal and interest as of June 30, 1967.

Item: Of the total, 35.8 billion went for military aid, most of it to complement America's cold war effort to build the shields against communism in Western Europe, the Mediterranean and Asia.

Item: Out of 86.6 billion in economic foreign aid, 14.7 billion represented the use of America's surplus farm products, much of which provides the United States with foreign credits.

Item: Economic aid also included 9.4 billion dollars in Export-Import Bank loans. Of that sum, 6.3 billion has been repaid. Another billion went into the Peace Corps work.

Humanitarianism motivated much of the aid to ravaged Western Europe and Japan after 1945, and there have been untold dividends, perhaps more evident during the 1950s than in the '60s. More recently America has poured almost five billion dollars in military and economic aid into South

Vietnam, not counting our own military costs there.

The attack on foreign aid is, in effect, one of those half-truths which are used to mislead the American public by partisan groups.

The grants and loans in the table published are accurate, and come from the Agency for International Development. But they do not tell the whole story.

Nor, we must add, does the rebuttal from AID. Obviously the foreign aid allocations of the past 23 years have not been entirely altruistic, and by no means a total "give-away." America's security has been enhanced at a reasonable price, and much of the money loaned has been and is being repaid.

However, AID has not spoken to the problems of graft and waste which also have marked many parts of the foreign aid program. Food intended for starving citizens of India has often become fodder for rats. Military dictatorships of minor nations have been shored up at the same time that our policy was to encourage democracy. Finally, in South Vietnam, where our presence is overwhelming, the stories of kickbacks and corruption in foreign aid funds are too numerous to ignore.

Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), after a tour of the area last December, has urged a broad congressional investigation of aid programs in the Vietnam War zone.

There are good reasons for the people and Congress to keep a watchful eye on current foreign aid projects. There is reason to question the sending of money out of this country when our gold balance is in jeopardy.

But to indict the foreign aid program as its attackers have is to distort the truth and mislead the impressionable and casual reader.

GEN. FRANK ROUSE

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, San Antonio is and has long been a center of military activity. One of the key military installations there is Kelly Air Force Base, home of the San Antonio Air Material Area. SAAMA employs about 26,000 civilians and an additional 4,000 military personnel. It is one of the key logistical depots for the Southeast Asia area; it is also one of the most efficient logistical depots in the Air Force. One reason that it is efficient and effective is because of the excellent command of Maj. Gen. Frank E. Rouse. General Rouse recently addressed an Air Force Association meeting in Del Rio, Tex., and his remarks I think will show the importance of the base he commands—and why his command has been a particularly effective one:

LOGISTICS AND PROCUREMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

(Speech by Maj. Gen. Frank E. Rouse, SAAMA Commander, at APA Convention in Del Rio, Tex., June 15, 1968)

Members of the Air Force Association, it's a true pleasure to be in the Queen City of the Rio Grande, with so many friends—friends of the Air Force and friends of mine.

I've been asked to speak today on the new development in military procurement—the role it plays in the Government's priority program to hire and train the hard-core disadvantaged.

Jobs are an important part of a national response to a complex, many-faceted prob-

lem, a dilemma with no pat answers. Whether we like it or not, we face a crisis in brick and mortar and a crisis in human spirit—decaying ghetto housing and deep-rooted feelings of discrimination.

The situation has become the most divisive and costly problem our country has ever faced. A leading industrialist put a long-range price tag on rebuilding our slums, cleaning up air and water pollution, while hiring and training the disadvantaged. His estimate: one trillion or 1,000 billion dollars!

No one is proposing we expend such an amount to rebuild our society; on the other hand, under-estimating the problem could be less than wise.

The best brains in industry and government have been recruited by the President to work together on the problem. Federal spending for the disadvantaged in the last four years, fiscal '64 to '68, was \$77.4 billion and the Budget Bureau estimates \$27.7 billion in FY 69. That's \$105 billion in five years.

In one way or another, this problem will touch the lives of every one of us here today—as businessmen, as military men, as retired military men, or as fully ordained taxpayers. We've a long road to travel.

But a journey of a thousand miles—begins with the first step. And the President says that first step is jobs for the disadvantaged. He points out the most affluent nation in history, a nation whose gross national product hit \$827 billion in the first quarter of '68, a new high, should be able to offer meaningful employment to every American who wants it. I might add a large portion of our task may well be to motivate many of these people to want the job—and to want to hold it.

Events last summer and this, indicate jobs are a key consideration and failure to provide them can be equated roughly—"roughly" meaning violently—in death and dollars. Immediately after the assassination of Dr. King, rioting, looting, and burning flared up in over 100 American cities—total cost that first week: \$45 million, 39 dead.

While Army Regulars patrolled riot-torn Washington, a CBS newsmen asked a Negro minister in the Watts area why Watts had kept its cool. His reply is worth consideration. He said:

"A few years ago in Watts it was burn, baby, burn. This summer it's learn, baby, learn and earn, baby, earn! There's hope today in Watts."

This Los Angeles ghetto, scene of devastating disorder in '65, didn't join looters in other cities who felt only one thing stood between them and a better life—a plate-glass window.

General Ruegg, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Systems and Logistics, spoke on the same subject recently in Dayton; he put it differently:

"Many of the looters stood to gain more in material goods than they had to lose in self respect. As long as that situation exists, the danger of riots will be with us."

Many observers believe Watts kept the peace because industry and government stepped in immediately after the blow-up with projects to create meaningful employment there.

These same observers caution, however, against the glib generalization, the pat answer, the easy cure-all. Case in point: Washington, D.C., long regarded as America's most riot-proof city because of its low rate of Negro unemployment.

If there is a common denominator to urban unrest, the President believes it is jobs, and the self-respect and human dignity they carry with them. Our experience at SAAMA supports this belief.

Let me quote from a Presidential memorandum of October 2, 1967. The President said, in part:

"We are launching today a major test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to

help find jobs and provide training for thousands of America's hard-core unemployed.

"The heart of this new effort is to reach the forgotten and the neglected—those citizens handicapped by poor health, hampered by inadequate education, hindered by years of discrimination, and by-passed by conventional training programs.

"To succeed in this venture will take more than promises or good intentions. It will require—on an unprecedented scale—the concerted action and involvement of the private sector, working closely with the Federal Government.

"Our purpose is not to hand out but to help up, to help provide every American the opportunity for a good job at a good wage. Our goal is to replace the waste and failure of unemployment with the productivity of meaningful work.

"I have directed each department and agency of this Government to give top priority to all phases of this important effort."

Signed: LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

In line with this, a number of responses are being drawn up by industry and government, in alliance, to accomplish the President's program.

I'd like to tell you about one of these to illustrate the magnitude of effort. The Department of Labor recently sent requests for proposal to approximately 1,000 U.S. business firms, soliciting bids on contracts to hire and train the disadvantaged.

A total of \$350 million has been made available for this "job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS) program." The target: contracts with business across the Nation that will put 100,000 men and women on the job by this time next year and 500,000 by June 1971.

This program is headed up by Henry Ford II and his national alliance of businessmen, with no direct connection with Defense Department procurement.

In San Antonio, Hull Youngblood heads the local alliance of businessmen. Hull, president of Southern Steel, shows how to succeed in business without satisfying a single "user" of his product (he's one of the biggest builders of jail systems in the country).

With a goal of 600 jobs for the disadvantaged, he's obtained pledges for 800 from Alamo City businessmen.

A deeply concerned man and a lay minister, Hull says a man taught a useful trade is far more likely to stay out of trouble than an unskilled laborer. Inmates at Huntsville penitentiary who learn constructive work seldom become repeaters, he points out.

Another concerned man is Mr. B. B. Saxon, who is just completing a \$2.1 million SAAMA contract to overhaul aeronautical ground support equipment. For some time now, as a matter of company policy, he's been hiring and training young Latin Americans from San Antonio's depressed west side. Incidentally, Mr. Saxon does not ask the Air Force for reimbursement for this, nor any training money from the Labor Department. Recently, he said this:

"The disadvantaged are this country's last big labor reservoir. If we want skilled mechanics and technicians we're going to have to train them. Let's not fool ourselves. If we don't, then we're playing musical chairs—hiring a skilled man away from a competitor who, in turn, will hire away one of yours tomorrow."

Joseph H. Allen, president of McGraw-Hill Publications, put it another way when he told businessmen hiring the disadvantaged makes sense—dollars and cents in management's long-range ledger. He stated:

"If you ignore the crisis, slums could siphon off more and more of your profits. Slums are a luxury few cities can afford, and much of what they cost is paid by taxes on business. Deterioration of the cities speeds up the flight of middle- and upper-income

families (and some industries) to the suburbs. Result: Tax bases are reduced, retail sales slump, and an increasing share of the tax burden falls on business."

Today, employment is near a record high, 75.1 million, and unemployment near an all-time low, 3.5% (3.1% for whites, 6.7% for Negroes). So where are the disadvantaged? The Labor Department identifies 70 American cities, 58 rural counties and 19 Indian reservations where hard-core unemployment is concentrated. Oddly enough, a number of these depressed areas are located in cities where unemployment is negligible (1.5% to 2.9%) cities like Chicago, Atlanta and, as I said before, Washington, D.C. These sections are particularly sensitive because the disadvantaged see themselves stranded on hard, bare islands of poverty, surrounded by lush jobs and income for most other Americans.

As for Texas—how many areas of concentrated unemployment do we have in the State? The Labor Department cites five: Eagle Pass, Houston, San Antonio, Texarkana, and Waco.

I'm sure you natives of Del Rio know your city, including all of Val Verde County, is classed as an area of persistent unemployment. Nineteen other Texas cities and their counties are similarly classed as areas of substantial or persistent unemployment (by official definition, 6% or more and expected to hold for the next two months, or 6% or more and 50 to 100% above the national average for up to three years).

As a matter of concern, all Texas border towns, except El Paso, are rated in one of these two categories. And because of this, these communities are entitled to varying degrees of preference in military procurement. It's a market worth close appraisal.

If the name of the game is jobs (and it is) then, defense contracts put the most chips on the economic table. In fiscal year '67, DOD contracts amounted to \$40.6 billion. Of this, Air Force contracts totaled \$11.0 billion and SAAMA's, \$621 million. Beyond a doubt, military procurement is a powerful force in the President's program to create jobs for the unschooled, the unskilled, and the unmotivated.

But before we talk further about jobs, let me make one thing clear. First and foremost, we're buying mission support, the most suitable we can procure on the American market, the hardware and services our military forces need. Under certain circumstances, we can do this and meet important social and economic objectives in the national interest.

With this in mind, let's take a look at three ways DOD defense contracts create jobs for the hard-core disadvantaged and for unemployed in labor surplus areas.

They are:

1. The labor surplus set-aside, in which we reserve part of a procurement for award to firms who will hire the disadvantaged.

2. The direct award of a total procurement to the Small Business Administration, who, in turn, sub-contracts the work to a concern agreeing to hire a number of disadvantaged persons.

3. A DOD-directed program by our major contractors to place subcontracts in labor surplus areas.

Now—let's take a closer look at these three approaches:

First, the labor surplus set-aside. Under this device we look at a procurement to see: (1) if it can be divided into two or more economic production runs, and (2) if there are known sources in hard-core or labor surplus areas.

If we meet these two primary conditions (and there are no extenuating circumstances), we normally make a labor surplus set-aside—usually half of the procurement goes out in open competition and the other

half is reserved for award to a hard-core or labor surplus firm, at the same price as the open competition "buy".

In a strict order of preference, we'll go down the list and ask labor surplus firms to match the successful award price.

This is the order of preference:

1. A small business firm in or near an area of concentrated unemployment who has obtained Department of Labor certification of his plan to hire a proportionate percentage of the disadvantaged in performance of the contract.

2. A large business in or near a hard-core area who'll do the same thing.

3. A small business that'll perform a significant proportion of a contract (more than 50% of the contract price) in a persistent labor surplus area.

4. A large business who'll do the same thing.

5. A small business that'll perform a significant proportion of a contract (more than 50% of the contract price) in a substantial labor surplus area.

6. A large business who'll do the same thing.

7. A small business not in a labor surplus or hard-core section.

It's interesting to note a hard-core or labor surplus firm can get both portions of a procurement if it's low on the open competition quantity. In fact, we've just made an award under these circumstances. Cryogenic engineering company received a \$487,400 contract for 49 giant liquid oxygen storage tanks. As a small business near Denver's ghetto section, with a certified plan to hire the disadvantaged, this firm was low on the open quantity of 24 units. So, under the first order of preference, it qualified for the 25 units that had been set-aside. Cryogenic engineering will put approximately 25 disadvantaged people to work as a result of this contract award.

This firm, like others who hire and train the disadvantaged, can be reimbursed by the Labor Department, up to \$3500 per trainee; labor officials say this \$3500 may be subject to readjustment.

Incidentally, the labor surplus set-aside isn't new—it's been around for a number of years. Last December, however, it was revised to give top priority to concerns with certified plans to hire and train the disadvantaged.

Since December '67 the Air Force has initiated 97 labor surplus set-asides with a reserved value of almost \$20.0 million; of these, SAAMA initiated 76, with a reserved value of \$4.4 million. USAF has awarded 17 with a contract value of \$4.5 million; of these, SAAMA has awarded 9 at \$600,000.

If initial results aren't as broad as we'd like, I think it's understandable, because of the change in ground rules at the first of the year. We're hoping the set-aside program accelerates now as buyers, contracting officers—in fact, all of us—become more familiar with this modified procurement device.

Now—let's look at the second way military procurement dollars create ghetto jobs—DOD award of a contract directly to the small business administration.

The authority to do this has been part of the Small Business act for a long time. But only recently—in fact, since the President announced his program to hire the disadvantaged—has this authority been exercised. While the labor surplus set-aside is a rather cumbersome device, contract "take-over" by SBA is somewhat less so.

Under this device, a DOD procurement agency awards a contract to SBA who, in turn, subcontracts the work to a firm with a certified plan to hire the disadvantaged.

SBA has established criteria for the type of items it considers suitable for this kind of award:

1. The item must be non-sophisticated in nature.

2. It should represent a continuing requirement so that additional contracts can be negotiated.

3. There should be a relative shortage of suppliers for the item.

According to Mr. R. C. Moot, SBA Administrator, the object of a take-over award is twofold: (1) To employ the disadvantaged, and (2) to help develop minority-owned businesses. The latter is a new dimension in the President's program. Often it means ownership of business in urban ghettos by resident citizens; at the same time, it means community pride and involvement resulting from economic accomplishment. These enterprises export goods and services outside the hard-core areas, bringing income back for growth purposes.

Currently, SAAMA is negotiating with SBA and its subcontractors for almost a million dollars worth of relatively simple hardware (the actual award figure is still in negotiation). SBA's sub is a San Antonio small business owned, in partnership, by an individual of Latin-American extraction. Naturally, we're delighted since the contract will put some 30 disadvantaged to work, in addition to the 23 already on board. Just as important, this concern is known to us, through previous contracts, as a high-quality producer.

Among contracts, let by DOD to SBA and now in production, are:

1. Manufacture of 2.5 million sets of ammunition powder bags for the Army; the firm is in Chicago.

2. Manufacture of 50,000 wood pallets for the defense supply agency; in this case, Fairchild Hiller assigned key executives to help Negro community leaders get a new enterprise off the ground in Washington.

3. Production of a year's requirement of bakery goods for Air Force basic trainees at Lackland. Here, SBA subbed a sizable portion of the contract to an existing producer and the remainder to a small Negro-owned bakery modernized with an SBA loan.

Mr. Moot said his agency is currently considering and negotiating a number of other take-over awards.

Now to the third method in which military procurement creates jobs. This is a DOD-directed program by our major prime contractors to place subcontracts in labor surplus areas and sections of concentrated unemployment.

Contracts exceeding \$5,000 normally carry a clause requiring a contractor to use his best effort to place subcontracts in areas of significant unemployment.

Contracts over \$500,000 which in our judgment offer substantial subcontracting opportunities, require the contractor to do the following:

1. Establish and conduct a program to encourage labor surplus firms to compete for subcontracts.

2. Designate a liaison officer to monitor company efforts in this field.

3. Provide adequate and timely consideration of these concerns in all "make-or-buy" decisions.

4. Assure these firms an equitable opportunity to compete, by giving careful thought to solicitation, time for bid preparation, quantities, specifications, and delivery schedules.

How does this work in practice? Let's look at Lockheed at Marietta, Georgia, builder of the giant C-5 transport, for which SAAMA will be logistics manager.

The big airplane maker is subcontracting a little over 50% of the \$2.1 billion C-5 program and a significant amount of this is being placed in labor surplus areas.

For example, Lockheed is subbing the C-5 power package unit to Rohr Aircraft in San Diego, classified as a persistent labor surplus

area. Over a three-year period, this will tally out at \$50 million.

In addition, the aviation giant has opened seven sub-assembly plants in depressed areas, places like Clarksburg, West Virginia; and Logan, Ohio. Right now, Lockheed is building a similar facility in San Antonio.

Multipled across the board, this program conducted by our major primes is a tremendous economic force in areas where unemployment is a problem.

These are the three methods in which DOD procurement dollars create jobs for the disadvantaged and the unemployed in labor surplus areas.

There's a fourth, I might add, and for those businessmen who take this route the rewards are substantial, more meaningful perhaps because they do it on their own initiative.

I'm speaking of businessmen in depressed areas who pull themselves up by their own bootstraps by aggressively bidding every procurement within their capability—whether it be labor surplus set-aside, small business set-aside, or open competition.

These people, usually small businessmen, get on bidders' lists throughout the Military Procurement System and then watch the Commerce Business Daily, a publication that briefs all DOD procurements over \$10,000. When they see those in their field of interest, they call or wire the small business and contractor relations chief at the procurement activity and ask for bid sets airmail. Our man at SAAMA is Jot Neri, WA 5-6492.

I'd like to tell you about the San Antonio Bank official who became known as a real procurement insider by reading the Commerce Daily.

His favorite story concerns the time he called a local Mexican food producer and asked the sales manager how he'd like to bid a million gallon cans of chili for the Army. He said the silence at the other end of the line was deafening.

My point is this: the Commerce Business Daily, available at a nominal cost (\$15 a year regular mail; \$67 airmail), is an invaluable guide to the military marketplace. A road map, if you will, pointing the way to a busier business community.

One firm who took this route is a little 40-man machine shop in San Antonio. Precision Manufacturing Company so far in fiscal year '68 has won award of 150 USAF contracts valued at \$900,000.

I've spent some time now discussing how industry and government work together to create jobs for the disadvantaged and the unemployed. In line with this, Laurence M. Gould, president emeritus of Carlton College, wrote something I think particularly appropriate. He said:

"I don't believe the greatest threat to our future is from bombs or missiles; I don't think our civilization will die that way. I think it'll die when we no longer care. . . . 19 or 21 civilizations died from within and not by conquest from without. . . . when people ceased to care."

I thank God I live in a country that does care. Industry, government, church and civic leaders and just plain folks—all are working in concerted effort to alleviate poverty and eliminate discrimination. Today's minorities can take heart from those who've gone before them—the Jews, Italians, Irish and others who've joined the American mainstream by liberally mixing inspiration with perspiration. I submit the American Revolution is still very much alive.

I'd like to close with something I learned in World War II while stationed in Chikiang, China. It's an old Chinese curse and it goes like this: "May your children live in interesting times."

As President Johnson says, these are times of turbulence and hope. Above all, they're interesting times!

Thank you!

WHY ARE VOICES HERE SILENT ON RED TERRORISM IN SAIGON?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very thoughtful editorial commentary on Communist terrorism against Saigon and the continuing aggression of the Communists in that war-ravaged land was written by Monsignor John M. Kelly, editor of the New World, the official newspaper of the Catholic archdiocese of Chicago, appeared in its June 21 edition.

Monsignor Kelly has, for a long time, been a very keen observer of the Vietnamese scene, and his editorial comments on current developments merit thoughtful evaluation.

The editorial commentary follows:

WHY ARE VOICES HERE SILENT ON RED TERRORISM IN SAIGON?

For many months prominent voices in this country were raised in loud cries to stop the bombing in North Vietnam as a prelude to ending the war. The bombing curtailment that was called for by President Johnson was expected by the owners of the voices to assure the Reds that we want peace. It was supposed, too, to evoke from them some reciprocal restraint, such as the cessation of infiltration and terrorist attacks upon civilians. What has been the result? It is just what we expected. True, there is some semblance of preliminary discussion to peace talks, but for the most part these have been made a mockery by North Vietnam, which refuses even to admit that it has any troops in the south. How peace talks can even begin with such bold and bland falsehood is most unexplainable. How can we be expected to place any trust in such an adamant and hypocritical adversary is inconceivable.

Far from showing any reciprocal restraint the communist north has stepped up its infiltration tremendously—by about 90,000 known raiders. (How many more have escaped detection is anyone's guess.) During the Tet offensive and ever since, newer and heavier weapons have been employed in almost constant bombardment and terrorist attacks upon every civilian area in the south. The constant attacks upon the Saigon populace fill the press. But where are the voices that cried for the U.S. slowdown? The eyes that wept bitter tears for the communist north apparently cannot see the constant slaughter in the south. They have no tears for the thousands upon thousands of refugees driven from their homes by the onslaughts of the communists from the north and the Viet Cong.

We can well wonder what kind of reaction the United Nations will have to a recent plea from South Vietnamese leaders of religious, professional, labor and cultural groups. (See story on page one.) I am afraid they can expect but little sympathy—and, probably, no help. The cablegram of protest was signed by the presidents of the following non-governmental and non-political groups: the Confederation of Vietnamese Workers, the Saigon Association of Doctors, Pax Romana, the Ravada Buddhist association, the Hoa Hao Buddhist association, the national Catholic Action, and 10 Catholic parish priests of Saigon, four Catholic religious superiors, and two student groups.

The cable stated that "since May 5 terrorist commandos have been blindly and indiscriminately bombarding the city of Saigon with mortar fire and rockets.

"On every occasion innocent civilians of all ages, women, children and sick persons

have been killed and wounded. Three million residents of Saigon are living in terror. Schools and hospitals have been hit where there was no possibility of a military objective being touched."

So far we know of no specific response to this cable that has been given by U Thant, who keeps calling for a total cessation of bombing. Mr. Thant, and those in this country who share his feelings, would apparently further tie the hands of American and South Vietnamese forces and their few allies and leave the civilian population of the south at the mercy of the communists. The bombing of military targets near Hanoi was to them a horrible and destructive outrage. The systematic terrorizing and destruction of Saigon and other southern cities and their civilian populations doesn't seem to move them a bit.

And what are we doing about it? Our fighting men are giving everything with great courage, as are the South Vietnamese. Everything, that is, that they are permitted to give in the wierd conduct of this war. More and more Americans seem to be hoping that the war will just disappear. They seem to be closing their eyes to the evils wrought by the communist Viet Cong and their superiors and allies from the north. Many refuse to see any connection between this war and the constant harassment by communists in other parts of the free world. With Russia supplying helicopters and countless other weapons for the destruction of South Vietnam and our own fighting men, we try to make treaties with the Russians. We seem, too, to be ignoring the Pueblo incident and the Americans still held captive by communists North Korea. Now communist East Berlin renews its harassment of free Germany. And yet there are those who tell us that there is no international communist conspiracy.

If, in the middle of our own growing national confusion, we weaken in our resolve to secure true peace and freedom for South Vietnam, we may be bidding farewell to the rest of the free world. The day may soon come when we will be badly in need of allies for our own protection. If we fail those we have now, there will be none left.

When President Johnson unilaterally curtailed the bombing, he warned the enemy that we would not permit the enemy to take over the south. They in turn have planned to do just that and are bending every cruel effort to do so. We should pray fervently that he still means what he said.

J. M. KELLY.

REVENUE-EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT, H.R. 15414

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, from various quarters there has come the assertion that a vote against the tax surcharge was equivalent to fiscal irresponsibility. I voted against the tax surcharge. I have no apology to make. Furthermore, I reject completely the charge of fiscal irresponsibility. On the contrary, I believe that those who recommended this increase—in the form it was submitted to us for a vote—have been irresponsible, if not to the budget then to the Nation.

The proposal was irresponsible because it was submitted to Congress in the form of blackmail. We were not permitted to vote for an increase unless we also voted a \$6 billion budget cut. How

that cut was to be made was not specified, but the implication was clear that it would come from the Great Society programs established to help the less fortunate members of our social system. In brief, Congress was blackmailed into reducing the funds of the poor in order to obtain a tax increase, though this increase should very well have been submitted to us on its merits, not in conjunction with a totally unrelated proposal. I was willing to consider a tax increase on its merits; I refused to be bullied into cutting social programs. Those who submitted the package deal to us, Mr. Speaker, were irresponsible. I voted against the package both as a matter of principle and for practical reasons. I will not vote to cut our social programs which are already too skimpy for the goals we must attain.

Furthermore, the package proposal was irresponsible because it made no effort to correct the inequities that already exist in our tax system. I see no excuse for not closing tax loopholes. We know what those loopholes are. We have had ample opportunity in the past to study them. The President's request for the surcharge has been before the Committee on Ways and Means for almost a year, time enough to include tax reform. But we were given no chance to vote for reform. Our vote was designed to perpetuate present inequities. I would not sanction a proposal to enshrine the inequalities of our taxing system, a system which in so many instances simply makes the rich richer. I would not vote for such an irresponsible measure.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that our economy needs some bulwark to sustain it. I do not believe that the poor and the salaried classes, by themselves, should be asked to build that bulwark. Too little was asked of the rich in this surcharge bill. I could not vote for such a bill and will not in the future.

OPPOSITION TO GUN-CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I have not checked all of the latest gun-control bills as yet, but I fully expect to find that at least one of them will outlaw private ownership of gas pipe and rubberbands. After all, any criminal can make a gun with these materials in a relatively short time.

Since Congress seems determined to create an issue rather than solve a problem, gas pipe and rubberbands will not be subjected to Federal regulation. But firearms may, and the prospect of it disturbs the people of Idaho.

Senator Kennedy's assassination is viewed by most Idahoans for what it was—a tragic, senseless act perpetrated by an unbalanced mind. But they refuse to accept a share in the blame for his death that certain commentators and pseudointellectuals would thrust upon them. Nor are they ready to pay the

penalty for his death that self-serving politicians now demand.

Why does the President seek a symbol instead of a solution?

Since coming to Congress, I have received thousands of letters, telegrams, and petitions opposing gun-control legislation. At the same time, I have received about a dozen supporting it. At the close of my remarks I will insert a few of these communications as representative of those which have come into my office in the past 2 weeks.

These letters clearly indicate that the people of Idaho condemn the violence and lawlessness which struck down Senator Kennedy. But they also show that these same individuals do not equate the hysteria that has followed the Senator's slaying with the need for firearms legislation. Despite what the Washington Post would have you believe, they are not "kooks" but rather responsible American citizens.

The letters follow:

JUNE 6, 1968.

Congressman JAMES McCLURE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: * * * Jim, it makes about as much sense for congress to pass gun control legislation in the passion of the moment as it would for congress to declare war on Jordan because the apparent assassin of Senator Kennedy was a Jordanian National. While one man with a gun did this worst of all possible things, there are one hell of a bunch of us that have never done anything worse than bust a hen pheasant and we don't intend to do anything any worse than that. Yet all the proposed laws get at guys like me.

I am quite hopeful that our leaders will wait until the heat is off before they act on anything. * * *

Well, I hope you are not sick and tired of being sick and tired. Meanwhile maybe I better go up to your house and bury a couple of your guns before the "feds" get here to gather them up. Best regards.

LAURENCE K. MONROE.

PAYETTE, IDAHO.

JUNE 7, 1968.

Representative JAMES McCLURE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McCLURE: Now that a new tragedy has befallen the history of the United States, the men with their own shallow answers will bombard our ears and eyes with the reasons as they see them.

There is again to be an overload of accusations toward how far we have fallen into the depths of complete chaos. But, are the American people guilty of these crimes or are we the brunt and excuse of it?

A President of the United States was shot and killed by a degenerate man, without a country, who in search for idealism traveled to a country completely opposed to our ideals, but was welcomed back without fanfare, assuming the error of his ways were now behind him, as the prodigal son returned after his lesson was well learned. This lesson was not to our benefit.

After the assassination the American people were lectured as to what to be in the future, to be as people in the rest of the world expected us not to be.

Naturally the only practical solution, we are told, is to disarm the man at home watching the events on television, wincing and feeling his own pain.

As the people listen to their future being plotted, being made to feel they are the criminals, we hear the bigots tell of our violence, we see advocates of hate blossom into full-time hate preachers, lauded in their

June 26, 1968

filth. We hear the highest court in the land tell us that God is now obsolete, as in the Constitution and Bill of Rights, in our superficial society. We see the guilty walk away from justice because they hold some immunity to the law that we do not understand. We are told contradiction upon contradiction as our news unfolds, we are pressed with filth by the press because of a story, no matter how biased or unwanted, is still a story with the right treatment. We reel in our guilt made to feel we are the scum of the earth. We see the lazy and loud have more rights than they want to earn.

Now a new killing has come to pass, because of extremism. We will be pressed to feel guilt again. I know of no one person that condones this killing, but yet, we will again take our whipping as if we are the killers and live in our violence.

They are right, we are violent. We have been fed a steady diet of violence, hate, bigotry, as though these are the only elements that we are worthy of receiving. We are sick—oh yes, we are sick—sick of the matter we constantly receive—sick of bigots—sick of the unwashed immature filling our lives—sick of being on the short end of everyone's private climb to fame, sick of one sided politics—sick of warped ethics—sick of being called sick and then told unless we get sicker there is not a chance for us—sick of supporting generations of bums that live to propagate.

Take all the guns away from everyone. We know that this will cure nothing. But, look at the votes and the feeling of power the virus of our sickness can assemble.

Look at the unlimited amount of preaching, in the name of humanity that will be done, now that a person from another land has again come and perpetrated a crime that we will be held guilty for.

WILLIAM O. WEISS.

BOISE, IDAHO.

BOISE, IDAHO,
June 6, 1968.

HON. JAMES MCCLURE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLURE: The tragedy of Sen. Robert Kennedy's death comes close to being a national disaster, dividing the country by attitude as to the appropriate reaction. Senator McCarthy and others claim the incident reflects a kind of "national sickness" in the atmosphere of which violent acts of individuals are precipitated by mass attention to the violence of Vietnam and domestic discord.

My feeling is that the fatal phenomenon encountered by Senator Kennedy was a psychological, rather than sociological one. The individual involved was not motivated by any violent trend in America; rather, his reasons for the act were highly personal ones, directed as much against the rest of us as against his victim.

Congress and the Administration would do well to begin figuring ways to effectively protect our leaders. A man simply cannot be forced to fear for his life because of his stands on the multitude of issues which face any principled leader.

The proposed gun control laws are symbolic of our overreaction to shocking employment of weapons. I don't believe they will do any good; but if some way can be found to make obtaining guns more difficult for unstable persons, I could support such legislation. This would include eliminating mail order sales of guns. I do not, however, want to see laws passed which will deprive law-abiding citizens of their right to "keep and bear arms" while psychotics, anarchists and criminals continue to arm themselves via black market channels. * * *

Please give your most careful attention to this matter; I believe it is of utmost importance to our country.

Respectfully,

GARY W. McDONALD.

JUNE 7, 1968.

HON. JAMES MCCLURE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Please weigh carefully the present arguments being presented for more stringent legislation on gun control.

Without question, and in view of Senator Kennedy's shameful and tragic assassination, all decent Americans would like to correct the conditions which have made such events possible; at the same time, I believe many good Americans view the problem differently and much deeper than the TV and radio news "experts" or the proponents of this tentative legislation.

In my opinion, some of the underlying reasons why such assassinations occur are:

1. The attitude and decisions of our Supreme Court which have made criminal prosecution much more difficult.

2. Nation-wide TV coverage showing people looting and burning business establishments while police stand with folded arms, watching.

3. The present National Welfare and Civil Rights programs seem to have given many people of smaller economic means the attitude that they are entitled to many economic benefits without the directly related personal efforts and responsibilities.

4. The penalties for crime are not severe enough. This, coupled with legal barriers to prosecution, has mired down the courts and law enforcement agencies.

In addition to this, the people who would comply with gun control laws are probably not the same ones committing the crimes. Why would a person intent on murder or armed robbery be concerned with registering a gun?

I respectfully request that you consider reform in some of the areas creating these conditions rather than attempting the almost impossible task of controlling and registering millions of firearms.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. JACKSON.

BOISE, IDAHO.

June 5, 1968.

Congressman JAMES MCCLURE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We join with the rest of the country in our sorrow over the shooting of Senator Kennedy. There is no explanation or excuse. It is a symbol of the Godless atmosphere that has increasingly permeated our country for the last fifteen or twenty years.

There is another, and more important, reason for this letter, however. Using this incident, unthinking people are trying to force through unrealistic gun control legislation. We are only two voices but we pray we will be heard. There is no way to legislate guns out of the hands of people who want them for the wrong purpose. Gun control legislation would play into the hands of those who would destroy our country. The Nazis took over in Norway in one day without firing a shot. Their agents had "registered" all guns during the preceding months and the soldiers simply collected them quietly.

Because we too have a deep love for our country we plead with you to do your best to block any "panic" legislation that might come before the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

C. L. BALDING,
BEVERLY K. BALDING.

EMMETT, IDAHO,

June 6, 1968.

Congressman JAMES A. MCCLURE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLURE: Are the many going to now be punished for the mistake of a few? Those who want to disarm us

are going to have a field day now crying for gun legislation. When we register our guns, it will then be only a short time until they will be taken away from us. Let another thing happen like the assassination of Senator Kennedy and we will be disarmed. That is the people who do not have guns for criminal intent. The criminal will be the only one with a gun. How are we going to prevent them from making them or smuggling them in from other countries which they are now doing?

Since the Supreme Court has tied the hands of the law officials and given all the advantages to the criminal crime has increased and it is not the fault of the people as the President said. We don't need more laws we need to enforce the ones we have. * * *

Sincerely,

MRS. LOLA FISHER.

JUNE 6, 1968.

JAMES A. MCCLURE,
Representative of Idaho, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: * * * I am sure that many members of Congress may become panicked into passing unwise fire-arm legislation. I am sure that you will continue to see things as they are and not be influenced by those who are lobbying for fire-arm control.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD CHRISTENSEN.

EDEN, IDAHO, June 6, 1968.

HON. JAMES MCCLURE:

* * * Sirhan Sirhan deserves punishment but so do the rioters, looters, police killers, Pentagon destroyers and all who act in such capacities with the sanction of our Government. How can we expect the sick minds to act? If the Supreme Court will protect the guilty why would it seem risky to a sick mind to carry out such plans? It will be such people as this who will still have access to guns while decent tax paying citizens have the right of ownership removed. Are there truly any men in the Senate or elsewhere in Government who are so stupid they feel the gun control bill, if passed, will eliminate assassinations? Those of us who will prove to be law abiding and register our arms are not the ones who use them illegally anyway. We just resent more controls being bound upon us. Do any of those who are for passage of the bill feel confident that they will remove arms from criminals by the passage? * * *

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. E. H. RICE.

BOISE, IDAHO,

June 7, 1968.

JAMES A. MCCLURE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCLURE: As you know, President Johnson is trying to push that so-called gun law through the Congress. I wish he would look at it at another angle. If the laws of this country take the guns away from us, we will be worse off than we are now. I am a police officer and work for the city of Boise. Men that are released from prison and put on probation, are not allowed to carry guns. However numerous times these men or some of them are picked up for a violation and at times a concealed weapon is found on their person. Many times you do not know they are carrying a gun unless you search them. First they will make all the people register their guns. The criminal elements of this country is not going to register their guns because they are not afraid to break the law and they do not want the law to know they have guns. Then crime rate will rise and then a law will be made that no one will be allowed to have guns. All the people who obey the law will turn in their guns. Then the criminal element will conceal their weapons so the law will not find them. Then when they need them they will have them. If the country unarms the good men of the coun-

June 26, 1968

try, then we are in trouble. Please assist us in keeping our arms. * * *

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL L. STEINER.

JUNE 14, 1968.

HON. JIM MCCLURE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE JIM MCCLURE: President Johnson told a commission he hoped it would uncover the causes of disrespect for law and order.

In the last couple of days we all have been blamed for crimes whether committed by an individual or a group. We hear America is sick, we hear we are deteriorating from within, we hear a lot about gun control.

Our trouble today doesn't need a commission appointed by the Federal Government to tell what is wrong. No one obeys the laws because no one enforces them. And why should a police officer enforce them? The way our courts are run today, sharp attorneys can find loopholes in even the best laws. A criminal's chances or a law breaker's chances of even reprimand are very slim. May I cite the city of Lewiston where nine shoplifters were caught, picked up, and all cases suspended. * * * Where a youngster in this area was instrumental in causing a person's death through just plain driving negligence and all he got was a \$100.00 fine. Where Cassius Clay and Rap Brown are still running loose and free. Had I been involved in similar incidents as the last two persons named, I'd be in jail by now. Where we spend money to build shanties in our nation's capital and I suppose replant the area at tax payers cost, is not only unjust but breeds contempt in many who try to obey laws.

Jim, this is where people get their disrespect for the law. You could read about it in the papers just about everyday.

When people know that they can loot and rob and yes, even kill and get away with it, I think we are asking for whatever we get. If the government enacts rigid gun control or take guns away I believe this is only one more way that the government is creeping into controlling our lives. I am not a gun owner. I don't plan on being one but I am against the ever threatening control the government is getting on us. I urge you to vote against this legislation any time when many are using the circumstances of the time to cloud decisions.

When the government decides that laws must be enforced, whether or not they cost a few votes, and when laws are enforced with ethical justice instead of some highly paid attorney putting items out of balance, we will have a more law abiding country.

Kindest regards,

DICK VAIL.

MOSCOW, IDAHO.

NAMPA, IDAHO,
June 10, 1968.

HON. SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Here is a grass roots expression on your proposal and pending bill for gun control legislation which you stated on TV you plan to introduce this week. I am opposed to gun control legislation that would require permits and licensing for guns.

I am not an N.R.A. member; I have not been misled by propaganda; I am a sportsman—not a gun hunter but an archer; I have arrived at my decision on gun control by my own personal thinking and through no blind following of any organization.

Without completely disarming the American public, I think such legislation would be ineffective. And disarming the American public is far too big a price to pay. Such action would have much more profound ef-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fects on our society than individual crime control. There would be repercussions in all levels of government and it would be a serious threat to the very freedom on which our nation is founded. You spoke of police department licensing and permitting of the possession of guns, allowing authorized personnel to have guns as well as the people who want guns for the protection of their homes. But we all have homes, the criminally intent as well as the rest of us, and thus it would be left to the decision of the administration as to whether we were allowed a gun or not. And think of the administrative costs of such a program—you know who pays for that.

We all know how prohibition worked—only the scrupulously law-abiding citizens went without liquor. And there are plenty of substitutes for guns that the murderously intent can obtain.

You remarked on T.V. that you did not see how we could go back to "Politics as usual". But what kind of politics would you expect us to use? Surely, in the heat of emotion is not the time to rush through legislation that we will later regret. I will certainly expect you to go back to politics as usual. The death of Robert F. Kennedy, candidate for president of the United States, was a sorrowful affair, as would be the death of any such candidate, and we should learn from it, but we are pretty unstable if such an occurrence is allowed to upset our world, or influence us to take hasty steps based on emotional depression.

Yours very truly,

BURTON W. REEVES.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CLARK SHOWS FIRMNESS BUT FAIRNESS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

MR. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Ramsey Clark, coordinating Government actions connected with the Poor People's Campaign and Resurrection City, has demonstrated the capacity to act with fairness and firmness. Thanks to Mr. Clark's ability to keep his cool, under sometimes difficult circumstances, the Washington Campaign and Resurrection City have come to a peaceful conclusion.

What could have been a violent confrontation turned out to be a dignified and nonviolent event. Feelings and attitudes on both sides today will make it possible for all parties to work together in the future toward the agreed-upon goal of assuring full participation in American life by all the people in the country.

Other officials who made major contributions to the calm climate in which the Campaign ended yesterday were: Chief Layton of the District of Columbia Police Department, District of Columbia Public Safety Director Murphy, Mr. Nash Castro, regional director of the National Park Service, Inspector Beye of the Park Police, and many others.

Looking back now, it is clear that the Campaign demonstrated, for all the world to see, that in our democratic society it is possible for groups of people to air their grievances in the Nation's Capital in a peaceful and effective man-

19017

ner. We should all regard the events of the past few weeks as a sign of the strength of democracy in America and as proof of the viability of our social institutions.

A COMMUNIST ATROCITY: THE TRAGEDY OF NEWCOMB MOTT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

MR. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Newcomb Mott was a young American who, while in Norway, happened to wander across the border into Soviet Russia. He was murdered by the Soviet Secret Police. Why?

Perhaps the little told account is best set forth in the recent book, "Incident at Boris Gleb: The Tragedy of Newcomb Mott."

I place a book review by Mr. Edward J. Sloane from the Manchester Union Leader at this point in my remarks:

AMERICAN TRAGEDY: NEWCOMB MOTT, MARTYR

(By Edward J. Sloane)

Sometimes the reading of a book is an all-enveloping experience. One is drawn into a hall of mirrors, a terrible place of echoing images and glassy eyes. One struggles to emerge into the world of light from the evil dream. Such a book is an event from which one never recovers, and one continues to be haunted by its echoes. Such a book is "Incident at Boris Gleb: The Tragedy of Newcomb Mott" by De Witt S. Copp, publisher: Doubleday, March 1968. Get it, even if you have to buy it. Read it slowly. You'll take a trip. You'll never recover.

Newcomb Mott was a young American from our "real" world. (home: Sheffield, Mass. College: Antioch, 1960. Job: College textbook salesman. Status in September 1965: On an interesting vacation in northern Norway.)

On the morning of Saturday, Sept. 4, 1965, Newcomb Mott took a walk from the small Norwegian town in which he was staying for a few days, wandered accidentally across the border into Russia, and never returned to our world again. He was entrapped by a robot in a hall of mirrors and murdered. The robot was the KGB, or, Soviet Secret Police, who had a job to do, and he was the "accident." The hall of mirrors was the Russian civil law.

Newcomb Mott was an American Tragedy of our times because he was one of those fine, sensitive, honest fellows (like the President of a famous University in New York City) who believe IT does not exist, that IT cannot happen to THEM. He was probably (the book indicates) smiling and shrugging his shoulders to the very end, saying: "Oh, come off it—it can't be so." But it was and is so. He was entrapped in a "reverse society" of mirrors, where guilt is determined by policy.

Newcomb Mott, American tourist, wandered into a nondescript Russian village on the border of northern Norway named Boris Gleb, a hopped-up KGB trap to pick up patsies, when necessary. The little people, the Intourist group, which is a KGB front, had to call their KGB bosses in Murmansk, who had to call their bosses in Moscow. The Boris Gleb people, who peddle cheap vodka most of the time to Norwegians on their motor scooters, had picked up an American tourist who had stumbled into this place by mistake. He could be traded for a professional Russian spy named Ivanov being held at the time in the U.S. for passing information to

the Russian embassy in Washington on the control system of the American Strategic Air Command.

A charge was therefore brought against Mott. He was convicted of the crime of illegally crossing the USSR border at Boris Gleb, and sentenced to 1½ years hard labor by a regional court at Mermansk, USSR. The main characteristic of the trial was that the ACT of crossing the border, once established, was sufficient to convict him. The intent of Newcomb Mott was irrelevant. He was guilty and innocence (lack of intent) was impossible to prove. Stacked. The State Department refused to trade Ivanov for Mott.

On his way to a Siberian prison camp on Jan. 20, 1966, Newcomb Mott died, probably at the hands of Russian criminals on the train. It looks like a tragic goof. The circumstances surrounding his murder are one of the tragic mysteries of our time. "Suicide" is the Washington Star's answer. (See Gwertzman, "Interpretive Report, The Case for Consular Pact," Jan. 27, 1967). The U.S. Embassy in Moscow on April 25, 1966, delivered its final note on the case: "Impossible to arrive at... the means by which his death came about."

In this time of the phony "detente," the Mott case is "must reading" for you, gentle reader. Try it, it's a real trip (armchair) into the terror.

ELMER BERNSTEIN APPOINTED MUSIC DIRECTOR OF SAN FERNANDO VALLEY SYMPHONY ASSOCIATION

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the appointment of Mr. Elmer Bernstein as music director of the San Fernando Valley Symphony Association—an event which promises a rich new chapter in the cultural life of the San Fernando Valley and the city of Los Angeles.

Elmer Bernstein is one of Hollywood's most successful and productive composer-conductors. Once a concert pianist, he has more recently devoted his diverse talents to the composition of original music for more than 70 films—including dramas, comedies, and western epics. His scores for "The Man With the Golden Arm" and "The Ten Commandments" established him as one of the motion picture industry's most original and capable talents, while more recently he has written the musical scores for such well-known films as "To Kill a Mockingbird," "Hawaii," "Thoroughly Modern Millie."

Elmer Bernstein has received many honors, including eight Academy Award nominations, television's Emmy Award, two Golden Globes, and citations from civic groups throughout the country. He is the third person in the 52-year history of the Walden School of New York to receive that institution's Outstanding Alumnus Award.

Elmer Bernstein is a past-president of the Young Musicians Foundation, a non-profit organization which provides talented young American artists with scholarship funds and professional encouragement; and as vice president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, he plays an active role in the

professional life of the Hollywood community.

I am greatly pleased to know of Mr. Bernstein's new position with the San Fernando Valley Symphony Association; I know that his abilities and efforts will continue to be of positive benefit to the world in general, and to the San Fernando Valley in particular.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 24, 1968, I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives designed to provide for the registration of firearms and the licensing of those who possess them.

The need for some form of tough gun control legislation is indisputable. Yesterday, the Federal Bureau of Investigation released new figures in their uniform crime reports series which showed that armed robbery in the Nation rose 26 percent between the first 3 months of 1967 and the first 3 months of this year. Aggravated assault with firearms increased 23 percent. The increase of serious crimes committed with firearms rose faster than the increase in serious crimes.

Each year in America, firearms are used in more than 6,500 murders, in more than 10,000 suicides, and in 2,600 accidental deaths. Since the turn of the century some 750,000 Americans have died at home from firearms—more than have been killed in all the wars we have fought. In addition, each year they are used in 44,000 serious assaults, 50,000 robberies, and result in 100,000 nonfatal injuries.

It is interesting to note that in Cleveland, Ohio, the percentage of homicides caused by firearms was 53 percent in 1951; in 1966 that percentage increased to 67 percent. Since June 1875, 79 Cleveland police officers have died in the line of duty—53 from homicidal violence, of which no less than 50 were shot to death. Lax gun control is a factor in this slaughter. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has said:

The easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the United States today.

Countries with stronger gun controls have a much lower level of violence. Firearms were used in 30 murders in England, 99 in Canada, 68 in West Germany, and 37 in Japan. This control over guns lowers the whole level of violence. The homicide rate in England is one-eighth the level in the United States. In the United States, the State of New York has had dramatic success with gun control. Her Sullivan law is the most stringent gun control law in the Nation and as a result her homicide rate is the lowest in the Nation.

The legislation which I have introduced will not take away any guns from law-abiding citizens. It will help protect every law-abiding citizen from the immature,

the criminal, and the insane elements of our society who may misuse a gun.

The bill covers any weapon which may expell a projectile by the action of an explosive.

The bill requires the registration of all such firearms imported into the United States as well as domestically owned weapons. In addition, transfers of firearms must be registered within 5 days of the transfer. Losses or thefts of firearms must be reported within 30 days.

As a result of the registration, within 1 year of the effective date of the act, possessors of firearms and ammunition must have a license.

There are limitations on who can receive licenses. No license will be given to anyone younger than 18. No one convicted or indicted for a felony may receive a license. No one who is convicted of any misdemeanor involving actual or attempted physical harm to himself or another is eligible to receive a license. Alcoholics, those addicted to narcotics, and the mentally incompetent may not be issued licenses. Aliens, also, are prohibited from obtaining licenses and thus owning firearms.

If a person who has a license falls into one of these categories, he must return his license and his firearm. Failure to comply with the act can result in fines up to \$10,000 or even 10 years in jail.

Any State may preempt this act by instituting a tougher gun control statute.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be passed. Progress toward keeping firearms out of the hands of criminal elements has already been made by the passage of the Crime Control Act of 1968, which covered, generally, the sale of short guns through the mails. Legislation is presently being considered before the Congress which would provide regulation of the sale of long guns in interstate mails. This legislation is also needed immediately. Hearings were held in 1965 before the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, on the Firearms Act. At that time, it was brought out that a Chicago police study of the records of 4,067 persons who purchased guns from three mail-order firms turned up the fact that 948 or nearly 25 percent of them had arrest records. The legislation being considered would prevent the easy arming of the criminal element.

As a judge in the Cleveland area for over 7 years, I had a first-hand experience with the gun problem. On many occasions, a gun abandoned at the scene of a crime was returned to its owner as lawful property. Registration and licensing would not abolish gun violence but it would establish responsibility. An unregistered weapon could be destroyed. Every unregistered gun destroyed would reduce the incidence of improper use.

In 1960, I urged the Cuyahoga County Grand Jury to recommend State laws on gun registration. A national gun registration law is also necessary to operate in States that fail to legislate in this area.

The constitutional and basic rights of an American citizen are not transgressed by laws which direct gun registration and licensing. The legitimate user of a gun will not be restrained. The criminal and improper use of guns

should be reduced for the benefit of most Americans who must rely solely upon the policeman for their protection at home and on the street. The policeman's work will be less hazardous and more effective. With this gun responsibility law the sanctity of our homes and the security of our streets may become a reality.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, three decades ago, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law a milestone in consumer protection legislation—the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. A ceremony at the Food and Drug Administration today celebrated this important event.

In reflecting on the uneven nature of food and drug protection under this act, it occurs to me that the quality of commitment is more important in accomplishing a legislative purpose than the quality of the law itself. It would also seem to be true that the successful enforcement of a law often depends on the nature of the institutional framework within which it is administered.

Accordingly, I take this opportunity to urge that those of us in Congress who champion the consumer interest consider whether existing governmental organization is adequate to the task of administering enthusiastically important new consumer protection laws.

On this 30th anniversary of the Food and Drug Act, however, one thing is clear: that all Americans owe a debt of thanks to Dr. James Goddard, the consumers' answer to Madison Avenue's White Knight.

Under unanimous consent I insert into the Record the excellent statements of Dr. Goddard, Miss Betty Furness, and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, as follows:

BEYOND THE LAW

(By James L. Goddard, M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs, at the commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, Washington, D.C., June 25, 1968)

I am happy to be able to take part in this observance of the 30th anniversary of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act before leaving the Food and Drug Administration just a few days from now.

Looking back over three decades, as we are doing today, gives us the perspective to recognize the continual growth of consumer protection in this country. After two and a half years as Commissioner of Food and Drugs, I have a keen awareness of problems that remain unsolved, and a certainty that the future will bring problems as yet unforeseen. But, as today's ceremonies so clearly illustrate, we also know that effective action can be taken to deal with consumer problems as they arise. This is reassuring to one who is leaving the Office of Commissioner. And, may I add, it is also reassuring to have a man of Dr. Ley's competence and dedication moving into that office.

The 1938 Act has proven to be one of the most effective and influential consumer laws

ever passed in this country. Without this law, and its subsequent amendments, we could not rely, as we do now, on the safety and effectiveness of our drugs, the wholesomeness of our foods, and the safety of the great variety of uses to which chemicals are put today.

But laws in themselves cannot do what they are intended to do unless there is a determination to bring them to life, to make them work. This is certainly true of the 1938 Act and its amendments. Without the dedicated work of the people in the Food and Drug Administration, the aims of the legislation could not have been realized. This, of course, does not mean that we have completed our job—far from it. But it does mean that the staff of this Agency has over a span of 30 years done its utmost to protect Americans against a variety of hazards, sometimes unforeseen, and at times unforeseeable. Thalidomide taught the Nation the importance of preventive action. The elixir of sulfanilimide tragedy preceded, and prompted, the 1938 Act.

We must recognize, however, that detecting environmental hazards before they land on the front pages is much more demanding than merely responding after tragedy has occurred. We must explore potential problem areas more thoroughly and put together in logical order the bits and fragments of scientific knowledge as they come to light. Let me emphasize this point: It may be frustrating at times to work with these bits and fragments, but this is the way of the scientist. Hard facts emerge step by step.

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act demands of the Food and Drug Administration progressive scientific leadership and the administrative skills necessary to achieve maximum compliance with the resources at hand.

I do not want to dwell on the activities of the Food and Drug Administration. But I do wish to make the point that good law—and we have good law in this field—is only the starting point for effective consumer protection. We cannot be complacent simply because sound legislation is on the books.

I have seen every evidence during my time here that the personnel of FDA have the capabilities and the dedication to meet the demands of the law. I am confident that we will continue to build on the firm foundation of the 1938 Act an ever stronger program of consumer protection to serve all our citizens.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY BETTY FURNESS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR CONSUMER AFFAIRS, AT THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY CEREMONY OF THE 1938 FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETICS ACT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 25, 1968

When I received your invitation to speak here today, I was warned by my associates that I would be preaching to the converted. I don't like to preach, much less to the converted, and I don't believe it will be necessary here.

Obviously, I did not come to tell you about the need for consumer protection. FDA has been involved in consumer protection for over sixty years. But I am happy to be with you on the thirtieth anniversary of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, to congratulate you on the work your Agency has done in protecting the American consumer, and to especially pay tribute to the man who has contributed so much to this effort—Dr. James Goddard.

It is difficult to think of any legislation in the past thirty years that has more directly benefited the consumer than the 1938 Act. This was the forerunner of all modern methods of consumer protection. Over the decades it has saved uncounted lives and prevented untold miseries. And it is not surprising that it was passed in the thirties, when there was so much public concern with consumer problems.

It was the time of the great depression—the most demoralizing depression of our entire history. Because a dollar was hard to come by, the consumer had to have a dollar's worth of whatever he bought. If the housewife spent a dollar for medicine, she did not want that medicine to injure her family's health. If she bought a dollar's worth of food, she could not afford to throw that food away if it was contaminated. When she bought cosmetics she wanted them to be safe to use.

It is easy to say that the consumer ought to be careful about what he buys. Of course he should be. But it is in the nature of our urban, industrialized society that the consumer is almost totally defenseless against a vast variety of dangers unless he is helped by effective consumer protection legislation.

The sick cannot possibly judge the safety of the drugs they take, or the medical devices they must use. The housewife has absolutely no way to find out about the cleanliness and wholesomeness of the packaged food she buys; nor can she make certain that the cosmetics she uses will not harm her.

Before our industrial revolution there appeared to be no urgent need for consumer protection. In rural communities, most food was still produced by the farmer, whose wife went to the general store only for those things which she couldn't readily make at home. And since she knew the shopkeeper, he could not get away with selling shoddy goods.

In the practice of medicine, no one knew for sure if the few drugs at the doctor's disposal were safe, much less effective. Cosmetics were restricted to a dab of rice powder for a shiny nose; respectable women stopped at that.

But even in the thirties, the consumer was learning that the slogan "Let the Buyer Beware" was outmoded. He insisted that industry assume the responsibility for the safety of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. He wanted stronger legislation.

The 1938 legislation, of course, was not the first of its kind. The 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act was the first Congressional expression of public concern over the dangers caused by impure foods, hazardous drugs, and harmful cosmetics. This was passed largely as the result of the efforts made over many years by Dr. Harvey W. Wiley. The passage of that legislation was also helped by the publication of Upton Sinclair's classic exposé, "The Jungle." It described the scandalous filth in the Chicago meatpacking industry that endangered American households.

But the 1906 legislation did not meet all the needs of the consumer. There were too many loopholes through which the devious and the greedy were able to slip shoddy, dangerous goods. And so, in 1938, with the aid of Eleanor Roosevelt, we got legislation that considerably broadened the powers of the FDA.

Consumer legislation is the result of consumer demand. But you and I know that protection for the consumer does not suddenly take shape because the public is vaguely disturbed. It often takes a national scandal.

The tragic event of the thirties was caused by the work of a chemist in a small drug company. Searching for a new solvent for the wonder drug of the decade, Sulfanilamide, he developed a preparation of Sulfanilamide and Glycol—a deadly poison used for automobile antifreeze. He found the appearance and flavor acceptable, and that seemed enough for him.

Unbelievable as this may sound today, he did not check his concoction for safety because there was no legal requirement for such testing. Before the Government had a chance to seize the drug, 107 people—including many children—had been killed.

The result was the 1938 Act which provided, among other things, for the pre-testing of new drugs.

Some of you who are here today may recall all the hard work that went into that

Act. In fact, that work may have been your own. I salute you for it. I also want to pay my own personal tribute to Dr. Frances Kelsey for keeping Thalidomide off the market and preventing tragedies from that drug in this country.

The FDA has accomplished great things in the past thirty years; it will, I am certain, continue to do so. And I can't think of anything more important than an organization which is geared toward safeguarding the public.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY WILBUR J. COHEN, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AT THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY CEREMONY OF THE FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 25, 1968

The thirtieth anniversary of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act is an event of importance to all of us and to each citizen of this country.

The law signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt three decades ago was a major milestone in consumer protection; it has pointed the way to other legislation designed to shield us against unnecessary hazards to which a modern, industrialized, highly complex economy exposes us almost daily.

This is not to say that the 1938 Act was the first attempt to protect Americans against impure foods and dangerous drugs. The original Food and Drug Act was enacted in 1906.

But even this pioneering statute was not the first legislation designed to protect the consumer. The history of consumer legislation actually goes back to the years just after the Civil War. The Postal Fraud Act, designed to protect people against the alarming misrepresentation of merchandise perpetrated through the mails, was on the books by 1872.

We must remember, however, that the Postal Fraud Act was directed at a rural society. The 1906 legislation, and to an even greater degree, the 1938 Act, addressed themselves to the entirely different problems of an industrial environment.

By 1906, and certainly by 1938, life in America had taken on an entirely different aspect. The country became urbanized and industrialized.

The Food and Drug Act of 1906 attempted to deal with some of the problems engendered by a changing environment.

It is not really surprising, looking back over the span of sixty years, that the first legislation was not a complete solution to the many problems faced by a dynamic and growing Nation.

While the 1906 Act pioneered consumer protection, the 1938 legislation was an emphatic bill of rights for the consumer.

In this day of organ transplants, antibiotics, and tranquilizers, we often forget how recent most discoveries in medicine are. A hundred years ago, doctors still applied leeches to anemic patients; only seventy years ago, the mystery of yellow fever was solved; only thirty years ago, sulfonamide came into use; only twenty years ago, antibiotics were discovered; only ten years ago, polio was conquered.

Legislation usually lags behind scientific and social developments. It is all the more remarkable then that the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, stimulated by the leadership of Rex Tugwell, recognized so clearly the changes that had come in America. The new legislation acknowledged that the consumer could no longer be expected to be the sole judge of the quality and purity of the food he bought, or the safety of the drugs that were prescribed for him.

In his message to Congress, President Roosevelt had said: "Even-handed regulation will not only outlaw the bad practices of the few, but will also protect the many from unscrupulous competition. It will, besides,

provide a bulwark of consumer confidence throughout the business world."

And here we have the key phrase: consumer confidence.

Since the passage of the 1938 Act, medicine has undergone dramatic changes in this country. Some 90 percent of the drugs used in medical practice today were not even known 30 years ago—a testimony to the foresight of that legislation.

And this kind of rapid progress was taking place in other fields and throughout history. If the world changed between 1906 and 1938, it has changed even more between 1938 and 1968.

The 1938 Act could not have anticipated all the revolutionary advances to come in science, technology, and marketing practices. But it provided a sound concept of consumer protection and a solid base for the legislative construction to come. The Congress has built on this firm foundation with successive amendments as new consumer problems became apparent. The Act has been strengthened to cope with potential hazards posed by food and color additives and pesticides. And the monumental and controversial Kefauver-Harris amendments of 1962, which assure the consumer that drugs are effective as well as safe and assure drug quality, are now accepted as part of the American way of life.

But this Nation's concern with consumer protection has not been limited to food, drugs and cosmetics. As we recognized other hazards of the environment—and as these hazards multiplied and increased in complexity—the Government has acted to protect the health and safety of our citizens.

We are now moving to deal with the difficult problems of air and water pollution. And President Johnson has given vigorous leadership in dealing with a variety of other problems. The record of this Administration is truly impressive: The Auto Safety Act; The Wholesome Meat Act; the creation of the National Commission on Product Safety; The Fair Packaging and Labeling Act; Truth-in-Lending. And the Congress is now considering other necessary measures to protect the consumer from such hazards as radiation from color television sets and to assure the wholesomeness of fish and poultry products.

But in discussing the legislative achievements let us not forget the great men who gave meaning to the legislation and who were responsible for carrying out the mandate given to them by the Congress. They were the men who forged new paths through the jungle of expanding industry and science. We owe much to them.

Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, the first to conceive the idea of consumer protection, brought righteous indignation to the cause of the consumers and the imagination to fight for them. For years he led the crusade for pure food and a healthier America. A man of keen insight and intelligence, a scientist and a reformer, Dr. Wiley fought tirelessly to give the American consumers the protection that he believed was their right. As the first administrator of the 1906 Act, he gave the enforcement agency the sense of mission that has guided the administrators who followed him. Under the leadership of subsequent Commissioners, Dr. Carl L. Alsberg, Walter Campbell, Dr. Paul B. Dunbar, Charles W. Crawford, George D. Larrick, and Dr. James L. Goddard, the consumer's interests were strengthened and safeguarded.

The integrity and the perseverance of this group of dedicated men have brought us to a new era of consumer protection. Their vigorous enforcement of the law, fighting against many powerful interests, helped to revolutionize the concept of consumer rights in this country. They were men of great energy, professional ability and much courage.

These qualities were exemplified in the leadership that Dr. Goddard gave to the Food and Drug Administration during the past

2½ years. His dynamic and superior leadership, his courage and his dedication to the interests of the American people have brought him acclaim from every corner of this Nation. Under his leadership the Food and Drug Administration has become a strong and effective instrument of consumer protection. He knew the dangers and hazards the people are exposed to and diligently sought to eliminate these dangers. He met daily challenges with resourcefulness and expertise. He was one of the most effective public servants I have ever known.

Under his leadership the Food and Drug Administration renewed its sense of mission to protect the American public. He made the public aware of its rights and industry aware of its responsibility. The Food and Drug Administration's scientific capacities were expanded, new relationships with the scientific community were established. Programs for assuring quality and safety of drugs were undertaken. All in all, the agency is more capable today of dealing with consumer problems more swiftly and effectively.

And I am confident that when the new Commissioner, Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., assumes his duties, he will carry on the work that Dr. Goddard began by acting quickly and effectively to protect the public interest. He shares the sense of mission that Dr. Goddard feels so deeply and will continue the agency's pro-consumer emphasis.

I believe that the effectiveness of Dr. Ley's work will be enhanced by the establishment of the new Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service. For the first time, the strengths of medicine, science and engineering will be brought together to deal with the broad range of environmental hazards to which the public is exposed. The new organization will enable us to more effectively utilize the total resources that are required to attack these complex problems. By using a team approach, I believe that we will be able to make an important new thrust in the closely related areas of environmental health and consumer protection. The new agency will deal with all the hazards to people which come from a wide range of outside sources.

We have called the 1938 Act a milestone of consumer protection. And that is exactly what it is—an important and significant marker along a road we are still traveling.

Even as we commemorate today the thirtieth anniversary of this Act, we are fully aware of how far we still must go to build a safe, healthy environment for all of our citizens.

Our Nation has always shown a great talent for building on the achievements of the past. And we shall continue to do so.

I can assure you that consumer protection has been one of my lifelong interests. As a young man, I read Upton Sinclair's book, *The Jungle*, which made a lasting impression on me and influenced my thinking through the years. I am determined that we must keep up the momentum of the consumer programs we now have and explore new and imaginative ways of identifying and protecting total consumer interests. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I shall make this a primary mission of our work.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 155th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

ABERDEEN WATER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Aegis of Bel Air, edited by Mr. John D. Worthington, recently published a thoughtful editorial on the critical water problem in Aberdeen, Md. I would like to share this fine editorial with my colleagues:

ABERDEEN WATER

There has been much discussion of late between government and public officials in Aberdeen and at the county level, along with the consultant who advises both parties, as to how the town should proceed with the solving of its future water problems.

Last summer, the town experienced an emergency when it was not able to supply enough water to its users and there isn't any reason to believe the same problem will not rear 'its ugly head' in the months and years to come.

Recently, at the suggestion of the county engineer, the town made overtures to Havre de Grace, hoping to reach some sort of an agreement for purchasing water on a regular basis. This is an appropriate step because Havre de Grace has water for sale and there is now a line between the two municipalities connecting the systems. There has also been an agreement between the two for the sale of emergency water to prevent any more of the same situations as last summer.

But what about the long term? Although the agreement with Havre de Grace is a stop-gap, it is dependent on several contingencies that might create further complications in the future. First and foremost, who is to say how long Havre de Grace could continue to supply Aberdeen its water. Suppose industrial growth in the Havre de Grace area expands at such a rate that some day they must say, "We're sorry, we need the water here and cannot furnish any more additional water for Aberdeen." In addition, the Regional Planning Council or higher authority may eventually place a limit on how much raw water Havre de Grace could take from the Susquehanna.

There are two other alternatives to be looked into. One is to sink new test wells to see if any additional water can be found inside the town limits. Aberdeen gets some of the best water available in the county from its five wells and this type of water needs less treatment for consumption than that from any other source, under most conditions. On the other hand, the consultant has said the Aberdeen water table has been on the decline since 1965 and his claim is substantiated when a new well was sunk early in the year next to the existing one and it did not increase the supply at all.

The possibility of additional well water is still being investigated and even if no more is found, the consultant has told Aberdeen its wells are good for years to come and has advised the town to continue their operation.

The other alternative is to go it alone by building its own new water plant near the Susquehanna Conduit. This has been suggested and is being pursued even further, but Aberdeen will find such a project almost prohibitive with the cost and other complications involved. It would mean incurring a huge bonded indebtedness for the town and would also require a working agreement with the county to release water from the Susquehanna Conduit as the source. It is difficult to believe Harford county would agree to this for the water from that line has been programed for other use and there

are certain conditions Baltimore City has set down with the county that would make pumping operations extremely difficult.

That leaves the final and what appears to be the most logical solution. Come into the Metropolitan system. At a recent Aberdeen Board meeting, the use of Metropolitan service was offered the town because the Commission is near ready and equipped to service all would-be customers in the Aberdeen area.

The cautiousness of the Aberdeen Commissioners is understandable. They realize the town's major source of revenue comes from the sale of water and they hesitate to move without completely exhausting the possible ways of expanding that source. As was stated by one of the Board members, the raising of property taxes is only a temporary measure and does not really answer financial needs. It is the sale of water that is profitable.

Because of Aberdeen's circumstances, its geographical location, its rapid growth and its projected needs, it appears the best direction would be towards the county for additional water and sewer service. This would allow the town government to take care of what it has in an efficient manner.

PRIVATE COMPANY LEADERSHIP
IN FIREARMS CONTROL

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in light of the growing problem of the misuse of firearms which is so much in the attention of the American public today, I was extremely gratified by the receipt of a letter from Sears, Roebuck & Co. outlining their regulations for the restriction of the sale of firearms to minors. I fully support such regulations, and commend Sears, Roebuck & Co. for its leadership in the merchandising field.

The following is a copy of the letter and attached regulations:

SEARS, ROEBUCK & Co.,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1968.

Hon. ROBERT LEGGETT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: In light of pending proposals for stricter controls over the sale of firearms, you may be interested to know the policies established by Sears, Roebuck & Co.

A number of years ago Sears elected to impose a total, company-wide prohibition against the sale of hand guns. This prohibition has remained in effect and will continue.

On April 26, 1968, Sears placed into force a policy which prohibits the mail order sale of rifles, shotguns, and other types of sporting guns as well as ammunition. Furthermore, Sears will not sell firearms or ammunition to any person under twenty-one years of age. These company rules restricting the sale of guns and ammunition prevail throughout the country, even though such sales would accord with State laws.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of a company bulletin which implements the described policies. Please call on me if you would like to have any additional information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. WHEELER,
Vice President, Government Relations.

RECORD OF FIREARMS SOLD AND RESTRICTIONS
ON THE SALE OF AMMUNITION, FIREARMS,
AIR RIFLES, AND AIR RIFLE SHOT

(Section I—Retail stores)

(Section II—Control stores)

Effective immediately, it is Sears policy not to sell any guns or ammunition to anyone under 21 years of age and to not accept orders for shipment direct to customer's home address. This includes rifles, shot guns, hand guns, air rifles, pellet guns, as well as ammunition for these guns. At time of sale and again at time of customer pickup, customer must show proof of age 21 years or over, such as a driver's license, draft card, birth certificate, etc.

The provisions of Bulletin S-380 Rev., dated May 27, 1958, (Secs. I & II for Retail and Control Stores) regarding local or state restrictions on sales of guns, air rifles and ammunition, also apply, including the keeping of records or receipts and disbursements of firearms.

RETAIL STORES—DIVISION 6 AND 200

Require proof of age 21 or over as described above when customer buys and picks up gun or ammunition. Do not accept any orders for guns or ammunition for shipment or deliveries direct to a customer address. Require proof of age 21 or over on any guns or ammunition put on "Lay-Away".

RETAIL STORE CUSTOMER SERVICE DEPARTMENT

Require proof of age for guns or ammunition placed on "Lay-Away", before giving to customer, at time of final payment.

CATALOG ORDER PLANTS

Advise all selling units, Catalog Sales Offices, Catalog Sales Merchants of Sears policy, that telephone orders and orders for shipment direct to customer's home address cannot be accepted. Accept orders only in person for shipment to store for customer pickup. At time of sale and again at time of customer pickup, customer must show proof of age 21 years or over.

To be assured that package is not given to a customer without proof of age over 21 years, selling units should write on the sales check "Proof of Age 21 Required", and control stores should apply stickers on package near shipping labels, "Proof of Age 21 Required."

On Direct Mail and Metropolitan telephone orders, advise customer Sears policy is not to accept any orders by mail or by phone for any guns or ammunition. Such orders must be placed with Sears Catalog Selling Units for shipment to stores for customer pickup. At time of sale and again at time of pickup, customer must show proof of age 21 years or over.

THE PRESIDENT DEMANDS
TOUGHER GUN LAWS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in one of the most moving and urgent messages of his administration, President Johnson called yesterday for the most comprehensive gun-control legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

Acknowledging the recent Safe Streets and Crime Control Act restricting the mail-order sale of pistols, and acknowledging the legislation now before the Congress to regulate the interstate traffic in shotguns, rifles, and ammunition, the

President has made it clear that, in this instance, half a loaf is just not enough.

It is not enough when nearly 8,000 Americans are murdered each year with guns.

It is not enough when 55,000 aggravated assaults are committed each year with guns.

It is not enough when 71,000 robberies are committed each year with guns.

The President has called for a national registration of all firearms. He has called for Federal licensing of all possessors of firearms in those States whose laws fail to meet Federal minimum standards.

I salute the President. I support the President. The time has come for action to control this national scandal.

And the time is now.

GUN LEGISLATION

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the mass hysteria for Federal gun legislation has grown to fever pitch and I am gravely concerned. Elimination of the constitutional right to bear arms is not the solution to the growing lawlessness and violence in our country. To illustrate this point, I call to your attention two articles: An editorial appearing in the June 20 issue of the Anchorage Daily Times, which outlines the special need of Alaskans for firearms, and an article by John Persakis, a native of Greece, who describes how his countrymen were deprived of their firearms, and how this made his country vulnerable to Communist and military control.

The articles follow:

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, June 20, 1968]

GUNS IN ALASKA

Let's talk about gun control.

Everyone is. It's the national emotional issue at this moment. And there is good reason for it to be.

The nation has been stunned by events which strike at our conscience as citizens of the United States and as human, decent individuals.

Our President was slain in Dallas by a mail order rifle. The most respected of the civil rights leaders, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., was killed in Memphis by an assassin armed with a rifle. The late President's brother was assassinated in Los Angeles by a man who apparently bought a hand gun in the last of a series of uncontrolled sales—from second hand, to third hand.

Across the land, in our great metropolitan areas, men and women of otherwise good will are arming themselves in fear of riot and terror.

The sale of weapons and ammunition—not for use by sportsmen or collectors—has reached something of a frenzy.

And no matter how the situation is viewed, it is real. There is concern. And there is reason for concern.

And somewhere, in all the furor, lies a solution. There must be, amid the emotions, a way to be found that will meet a real need in the areas where gun control is a crisis of high order—while still serving those areas where the situation is not inflamed.

The easy way for us would be to join

those who clamor for rigid control on the sale and shipment of fire arms and ammunition. But that would not serve the interests of Alaska or the needs of Alaskans.

We're different here. The problems we have in Alaska are not the problems of Dallas or Memphis or Los Angeles—or Detroit or New York or Washington, D.C., for that matter.

Because of that difference, we have been excluded before in national legislation.

We are excluded from the Interstate Highway program, although we pay all the federal gasoline taxes any other state pays.

We are penalized by the Jones Act in a way no other state among the contiguous 48 states is penalized.

We are a land apart in a dozen other pieces of federal regulations and controls—some to our benefit, others to our detriment.

But the precedent is there. And it could well apply to gun controls, too.

If the rest of the states have problems, they should be solved. If it requires federal legislation, the laws should be enacted.

But there need be no blanket law that would penalize Alaskans for the troubles in other states.

We don't have political assassins roaming our streets and hotel kitchens. We don't have riots and civil turmoil.

But we do have wilderness. And we do have hunting—for subsistence and for sport. We have the frontier—and the frontier requires firearms and men who know how to use them.

It's easy to demand passage of a law. But a law construed to solve an emotional or practical need in one area of the country, in this case, may not serve another.

Let Congress write its gun control laws if it must.

But include Alaska out. It can be done. And it should be done, if anything of this nature is to come about in this land of ours.

OH, BUT WE WILL HAVE GUNS

(By John Persakis)

As a native of Greece who has seen his country governed by a home-grown dictator, invaded by Nazis, engaged in a bloody civil war with Communists, and now taken over by a military government, I feel qualified to speak out on firearms registration in any country which thinks its democracy is eternal.

My observations are pertinent to the United States as well as Greece because I once got into a meeting of Communists in New York where the party's attitude toward firearms was spelled out with chilling clarity by one remark.

It was in 1943, just after I had arrived in this country as a Greek seaman during the war. I was in New York. One day I went along to a meeting, the Communist nature of which I didn't realize until it was well underway. A few new members were sworn in with the words, "You are now members of the Communist Party," and some longstanding members stood up to report on their activities. Then we were instructed how to gain control of a labor union meeting. A raffle of Marxist books was held, and quite an uproar occurred when one man won most of them. Then came the key lecture.

We were told that we should support anti-firearms legislation in every way possible. Following the war, as is now known, the Communists had plans for the United States which did not exactly coincide with the plans of the American people. When we got the word on firearms, I innocently turned to the man next to me and said:

"I have a couple of guns. What's wrong with owning a gun?"

He looked at me and simply smiled, then said:

"Oh, but we will have guns."

I left that meeting somewhat shaken.

My firearms experience had begun in a roundabout way and was connected with sports, not with politics. As a youngster, I

had admired my father and his sportsmen-hunter friends and it is probably safe to say that I began to like guns mainly because of the people who used them for sporting purposes. My father, a long-time hunter and shooter, taught me to use a gun safely when I was 14 and showed me where his revolver was kept and how to use it.

I had my first handgun at the age of 17, a Colt New Service in .455 Eley, and there were a number of other firearms around our home. They were not locked up. Every member of the family knew where they were and how to use them. They were always loaded.

(The only accident that befell me was when my mother found out that I cut one corner off a pocket in my trousers so the barrel of my revolver would fit through.)

When I was old enough, I joined the Greek Merchant Marine Cadet School in Greece and that's where I was when the war broke out. I joined the U.S. Merchant Marine in 1943.

It was then, as a newcomer to this country, that I got into the Communist meeting. It was wartime then, the United States and Russia were close allies, and the Communists were much less suspected than now for their real aims. But with that one remark—"Oh, but we will have guns. . . ."—they made no bones about their aims.

The incident had a particularly severe effect on me because I had just gotten out of a country—my native country—which had seen the worst effect of disarming a populace.

There were no restrictions on the ownership of firearms in Greece until the dictatorship of J. Metaxas a few years before World War II. The people were then ordered for the first time to go to their local police station and register their firearms.

Soon they were ordered to turn in all firearms to the police, with the government promising to return the guns in a few days. To everyone's surprise, they were returned. Very soon thereafter, another order came from the government to turn in all firearms. This time there was no promise of a return. There was also no chance to hide the guns because they had all now been registered, and the police—by having the confiscation "drill" first—had conditioned the public and thus could demand a surrender of all arms without danger of a rebellion.

This was the last time the Greeks ever saw their guns. Handguns were permitted to stay in private ownership temporarily because Metaxas did not feel these were as much of a danger to his regime as long guns were.

When the Nazis marched into Athens, virtually their first act was to order the surrender of all firearms. Their job was made easier because the Greek government had effectively disarmed its own people before the invaders arrived.

When my father obediently took his good Smith & Wesson revolver to the police station, one of the local Greek policemen whom the Nazis kept on duty suggested a swap: His nondescript Spanish imitation of an S&W for my father's fine one. "Why not let the Nazis have this old pot metal pistol?" he asked. No one will know. My father could not help smiling sadly as he refused.

"The Nazis now have your police station files listing all firearms by make, model, caliber and serial, together with their owners. Remember?"

The policeman remembered. Yet he did not seem to realize that the confiscations resulted from the arbitrary, oppressive gun law that he had enforced.

And when the Communist guerrillas tried to take over Greece after the Nazis left, where did the guns come from which defended Greece? From the United States. By the end of 1947, large areas of Greece were in Communist hands, and they had actually proclaimed a provisional government in the

northern mountains. The American people had to supply the guns which had been taken away from the Greek people by their own government. Otherwise, Greece would now be on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

It is no secret that the present military government in Greece has ordered all firearms turned in, but has relented in the case of shotguns.

I am convinced that those people who are now clamoring for firearms registration in the United States are in the same state of mind as that policeman back home. Unless, of course, they are politically motivated.

In which case I have no doubt that "they" will have guns.

THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues will enjoy the following tribute paid to Mr. James A. Farley in the Hartford Times on the occasion of his 80th birthday. Mr. Farley needs no introduction to the Congress—he is an admired and dear friend of many of us. We Democrats are proud that he is of our party; and certainly all America can be grateful for his lasting and continuing contribution to his country.

The Hartford Times piece, written by Art McGinley, follows:

EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO JAMES A. FARLEY

(By Art McGinley)

James Aloysius Farley last week pulled up at the 80th milestone in a life of conspicuous service to his country, his church and many deserving projects—one of the nation's most useful and most respected citizens.

I first met Jim Farley almost 50 years ago and have had many contacts with him, both in meeting him at various gatherings and through exchange of letters.

The man who sold Franklin D. Roosevelt to Democratic leaders throughout the country and then directed FDR's campaigns with impressive astuteness, is fiercely proud of his Irish ancestry and, now and then, would send a friend a letter written in green ink. I had one such a few years back.

St. Patrick's Day is a red letter day for the former postmaster-general and always on March 17 he is on the reviewing stand with other dignitaries as thousands of his fellow Irishmen swing by the reviewing stand. Many years ago I was on the reviewing stand for this parade, having gone there with Lt. Gov. William T. Cart II who was representing the State of Connecticut, and that day enjoyed a chat with Mr. Farley.

HIS AMAZING MEMORY

Jim Farley has a remarkable memory and countless stories are told of his ability to remember names and faces. . . . The late Moe Berkman, long years the Hartford Times political writer, once told me a story in instance. "I had met Jim Farley but once", he told it. "Then more than a year later I was seated in a hotel lobby in Bridgeport when Mr. Farley entered the hotel, walked over to me and said, 'Hello, Mr. Berkman; how is everything in Hartford?'"

Several years ago when Hank Greenberg, who began his brilliant baseball career in Hartford, was being inducted into the Saints and Sinners at the Waldorf in New York, I was the guest of Howard Dunham of Wethersfield, former Connecticut state insurance commissioner, and found myself

seated between Jim Farley and Actor Ray Milland. Mr. Farley regaled me with a budget of recent happenings in Hartford and asked about Tom Spellacy, Bill Ranlin and other of his Hartford friends.

NOT ALWAYS ARTICULATE

My first meeting with Jim Farley had been in the early 1920's when he had come to Hartford to be the speaker at a dinner honoring Connecticut's first state boxing commissioner, the late Thomas E. Donohue of New London. Mr. Farley was serving an apprenticeship in public speaking then and was far from the accomplished speaker he was to become. This may be just a story but I was told years ago by a New York City man that Al Smith had said to Jim Farley, when Jim was a virtual newcomer in the political arena, "Get yourself appointed a district deputy for the Elks, get up on your feet somewhere every night"; that Farley did this and that it was the springboard to the oratorical grace the onetime Democratic national chairman has brought to many political occasions, sports dinners and like events for many years.

BOXING COMMISSIONER

Jim Farley for several terms was a member of the New York Boxing Commission; his fellow members were Bill Muldoon, who had been a wrestler in younger days and the symbol nationally of physical fitness, and George Brower. Brower, later to be district attorney and a state supreme court justice, was my cousin.

This commission was the target of the sarcasm of Manhattan sportswriters, but Messrs. Farley, Muldoon and Brower did a great job of keeping boxing in line and they were serving in the gala day of boxing, the era of Jack Dempsey and the million dollar gates.

Jim Farley was a warm friend of the boxers who surely needed an advocate in a game which has spawned many undesirable characters.

AN ARMY OF FRIENDS

It seems reasonably safe to say that no man in our country has more friends than James A. Farley; and he has nurtured these friendships by keeping in contact with many friends. He is a prolific letterwriter and nothing pleases one more to have a personal missive from a man of Jim Farley's importance. The late Nick Lynch of Hartford had been brought up in Haverstraw and was duly proud of having been Jim Farley's fellow-townsmen. Nick would hear now and then from Mr. Farley. Then recently a West Hartford woman telephoned me to say she had been brought up in Haverstraw in Jim Farley's time there and that she had been greatly warmed by occasional letters from him in recent years.

Jim Farley's political career and his personal life have been as clean as a parade ground on inspection day and he has been in places of great power and persisting temptation. He has kept physically fit always (never touched liquor or tobacco) and, tall and finely built, is an impressive figure in any gathering.

It is good to find Jim Farley reaching four score in fine fettle, but it is permissible to wish he might again be just a young man on the threshold of the great contribution he has made to the country he loves so much.

THE BEST BARGAIN IN THE FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey by Grade Teacher magazine

shows that only 17 percent of all prospective teachers are willing to teach in inner city schools. A vast majority—76 percent—prefer suburban schools. Only 2 percent indicate they are ready to teach in the rural areas.

This gives us an idea of the crisis in American education. In an era when our cities and rural areas are facing some of the most serious problems, educationally speaking, our teachers, generally, do not prefer to teach in these areas. There is a glimmer of hope, however. The Teacher Corps is a program that sends able college graduates into poverty areas to teach the children of the poor. The Corps graduated its first group of teacher interns in June. A survey of the graduates indicates that a heartening 72 percent intend to return to the poverty area schools on a regular basis.

Yet, despite these great strides in areas of vital need, we now have an appropriations bill in the House which will seriously cut back the Teacher Corps program.

This year the Corps spent \$17.3 million and sent 1,800 teacher interns into 30 States. This, as you can see, is a modest program. Throughout the country local school officials have called for an expansion of their programs. The Corps proposed a budget of \$31.2 million for the next fiscal year which would allow it to place 1,500 more teacher interns this year and provide for forward funding of 1,500 more for next year. Knowing the desperate educational needs of this country this request, under no circumstances, could be called extravagant. In fact it will require \$25 million to continue the present program. The Appropriations Committee has called for a cutback of the Corps program to \$15 million.

I would vote for an amendment that would restore the modest request of the Teacher Corps and urge my colleagues to do likewise. Life magazine called the Teacher Corps the "best bargain in the Federal education program." This is no time to be throwing away bargains.

H. RAP BROWN BOOTED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, SNCC which only gives out its releases to the "Soul" press has kicked our Rap.

But the party line remains the same—the same as the U.N. and the Communist International—against "racism, capitalism, and imperialism."

Wonder what will happen to the Fords, Rockefellers, and the other tax-free industrialists when they learn the truth—that they are capitalists so they have to be racists, according to SNCC, Castro, Moscow, and Peking.

Mr. Speaker, I include two reports from the Atlanta Journal for June 20:

SNCC HERE DENIES REPORT OF HUTCHINGS AS CHAIRMAN

(By Harmon Perry)

A high-ranking spokesman for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee office in

Atlanta has denied published reports that a 26-year-old New Jersey Negro has been elected new national chairman of the militant civil rights organization.

It was confirmed in Atlanta, however, that H. Rap Brown has been replaced as SNCC chairman.

Donald Stone, a former SNCC field representative, said Thursday that Philip Hutchings has not been named to replace Brown as national SNCC leader.

News reports earlier this week from Newark, N.J., said Mr. Hutchings, a former organizer for the Students for a Democratic Society, was voted chairman during a meeting in Atlanta last weekend. SNCC officials in New York declined comment on the report.

Mr. Hutchings, New Jersey coordinator for SNCC, reportedly declined to comment when confronted by newsmen at his Newark apartment. He said an official statement would be given to the Negro press only.

Mr. Stone said Mr. Hutchings did attend the Atlanta meeting but was not made national chairman. He said the organization is now being steered by seven elected "deputy chairmen."

A release from the SNCC Atlanta office dated June 17 refers to Brown as having served as chairman from May 1967 until June 1968. The release also stated SNCC voted to "restructure" the organization at its annual staff meeting June 11-15.

In the release SNCC stated the decision to move toward restructure was "in order to better deal with the repression and persecution of militant black leaders and to better continue its struggle against racism, capitalism, and imperialism."

The following were identified in the SNCC statement as deputy chairmen: George Ware, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama; Johnny Wilson, New York City; Mr. Stone, Atlanta; James Forman, New York City; Bob Smith, Atlanta, and Stanley Wise of North Carolina and Louisiana. The seventh deputy chairman was identified only as Brother Cook of Los Angeles. Other deputy chairmen are expected to be elected later. Mr. Forman was SNCC's first chairman.

The only other reference to Brown was that he will continue to be active in the organization. Mr. Hutchings, a former classmate of Stokely Carmichael at Howard University, was actually elected program secretary, according to SNCC.

No reason was given why Brown is no longer chairman.

Mr. Stone said Brown chose not to seek re-election.

The lanky, 24-year-old Brown, who is awaiting an appeal on a Louisiana court conviction on carrying arms across state lines, is now living in New York City with his school-teacher wife.

FORD OFFERS GRANTS TO NEGRO NEWSMEN

NEW YORK.—The Ford Foundation has announced three grants totaling \$226,000 to aid Negroes who want to enter journalism and to help newsmen do a better job of reporting on minority groups.

The grants go to Columbia University, Syracuse University and the new School for Social Research in New York.

THE CRIME BILL: "MORE GOOD THAN BAD"

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has wisely decided to sign the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of

1968. Although the act contains a number of undesirable features, he correctly concluded, in my judgment, that it "contains more good than bad" in assisting the battle against crime in this country.

The "good" provisions of the act include a variety of Federal aid programs to assist and strengthen local law-enforcement agencies and personnel. Among the new programs are making Federal aid available in order to improve local law enforcement; authorizing student loans and tuition grants in order to attract better law-enforcement officers and improve their education; expanding training opportunities for State and local police officers at the National Academy of Federal Bureau of Investigation; and providing Federal funds to supplement police salaries and to encourage community service training for police officers.

These programs will work directly to reduce the shocking crime rate and lawlessness in our society by assisting those who have immediate responsibility for the control of crime. To have vetoed this legislation would have prevented these programs from going into immediate effect, in disregard of the urgency of the situation.

LET PEACE BE HIS MONUMENT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the tragic assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and many ideas have been voiced about an appropriate monument to this young man who was so dedicated to his country and to a peaceful world.

No one has said it more eloquently than Mr. I. L. Kenen, executive director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, in the June 11 issue of the Near East Report. His article, "Let Peace Be His Monument," is an outstanding tribute to Senator Kennedy, and I include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I call it to the attention of all those who mourn his passing, but who are equally determined to bring about that peace of which he dreamed.

The article follows:

LET PEACE BE HIS MONUMENT

There will be many monuments to the memory of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. None would be as significant or as enduring as a renewed dedication to the struggle for peace.

For that was what he was seeking—in Southeast Asia, in the Near East and in our own country. He wanted an Arab-Israel peace and he wanted America to be the friend of Arabs as well as Israelis.

If we are to serve that purpose sincerely, if we truly seek harmony and understanding between peoples, religions, races and nations, we must steadfastly reject the evil doctrine of collective guilt. We should not permit grief and bitterness to find expression in rancor and hostility.

Spurning accusations of collective guilt, we must nevertheless recognize that we all share a collective responsibility for the future—to

do what we can to end the hatreds which are brutalizing mankind and which have wantonly triggered death for the great and for the multitudes in many lands.

We should suspend judgment on the reasons for Kennedy's murder. There is no evidence that Sirhan Sirhan, the young Jordanian accused of the crime, acted at the instigation of any one person or group. Until the trial—and perhaps not even then—we cannot be certain of his motivations.

Was he impelled by a personal paranoia? A national paranoia? Was he influenced by the unhappy circumstances of his youth in Jerusalem? Or by the frustrations of his life in Pasadena? Was he swept by the wave of violence which has tarnished the American scene with a bloody stain? Was he driven by the hatred of Jews, of Americans, of himself, of humanity? Was he ambitious to become a "hero" in the Arab world?

As a nation we have been stunned and shocked by the succession of brutal assassinations in our own country. We must try to learn reasons and remedies. But we should not lose our balance in masochistic self-accusation.

Violence is not peculiar to the American scene; assassination is a world-wide and age-old phenomenon. (The word has its roots in *hashish*, the drug which intoxicated a secret order of religious fanatics, the "assassins" who flourished in Persia and Syria centuries ago.)

The Soviet press has self-righteously attacked the United States for disclosing that Sirhan is a foreigner as an attempt to transfer blame to "foreign circles." But Communist history is replete with political murder as the fate of Lenin, Trotsky, Kirov—and many others—records.

The gun has changed many governments in the Arab world in recent years. Assassination ended the regimes of 12 heads of states in six Arab countries since the end of World War II. And there have been many recent assassinations attempts, including one against the Christian Lebanese leader Camille Chamoun as recently as May 31, one against Nasser on May 2, one against Boumedienne on Apr. 25.

It was an Arab propagandist who was quick to link the Kennedy assassination with the Arab-Israel conflict.

Within hours of the news of Sirhan's identity, Mohammed T. Mehdi, the secretary-general of the Action Committee on American-Arab Relations in New York, put out an insensitive statement in which he speculated that Sirhan may have been inflamed as a result of Kennedy's support for Israel in the television debate with Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy on June 1.

"It is this disrespect for the human Arab person which brings about this kind of violence," he said. "We condemn the fact that Senator Kennedy had kowtowed to the Zionist pressure to the detriment of American interest in the Middle East as we condemn the act of Mr. Sirhan."

[A short time later, newspapers quoted Sirhan's acquaintances in Pasadena that he hated Jews and Israel. And there was Mayor Yorty's disclosure that Sirhan's diary included an entry that Kennedy must be killed before June 5, the anniversary of the war.]

We quote Mehdi's statements because it is necessary to set the record straight and challenge his distortion.

Differing with Mehdi, *Al Destour*, a leading Jordanian paper, told its readers: "Well-informed Arabs had been hoping for a better understanding in the United States if Kennedy had been elected."

The record should be clear. Kennedy's attitude toward Israel was not unique. He was reflecting the views of most Americans. All the major candidates for the Presidency were agreed that the United States should send arms to Israel; and this—not because of any hostility to the Arabs—but because there is an urgent need to offset the arms which the

Soviet Union has been sending to the area; and this—not because we want war—but because we want to prevent it. All the candidates wanted negotiations and peace.

Friendship for Israel does not mean hostility to the Arabs. Americans accept this as self-evident. But there is an Arab proverb which holds that "the friend of my enemy is my enemy." That has long been the major collision point in U.S.-Arab relations.

The record of Robert Kennedy and of the Kennedy family certainly belies this Arab dogma. The late President Kennedy was a friend of Zionism and Israel; yet he was able to win the confidence of President Nasser and to help the Egyptian people and their economy. Sen. Edward Kennedy has devoted many hours and days and weeks to intensive study of the Arab refugee problem.

In one of his first legislative acts early in 1965, after he became a Senator, Robert Kennedy objected to a drastic House amendment to terminate aid to Egypt. He felt this was a matter for the White House to decide.

In a statement given to constituents on June 8, 1967 in Washington, on the fourth day of the war, he said:

"Let us hold out our hand of friendship to the Arab peoples, so long living in poverty and disease and misery, so long the tools of irresponsible propaganda, so long the greatest losers from the military adventures of their leaders."

And in a statement submitted Apr. 29 for publication in the *Near East Report*, Kennedy declared:

"We must aid and encourage those Arab leaders who turn away from war, and lend our finest minds and efforts to the elimination of poverty, hunger and despair in the Arab lands."

Just a year ago, on June 12, 1967, both Kennedy and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller were denounced at the UN because Arab diplomats then blamed the United States for Israel's victory.

Kennedy reacted mildly and temperately. The Middle East, Kennedy said, would be better served "if the Saudi Arabian delegate and his government and all governments paid more attention to the need for economic development and permanent peace than to criticism of political figures in the United States."

American political leadership has always been the victim of two irrational obsessions: first that the United States was hostile to the Arabs; and second that American support for Israel was dictated by mercenary politicians seeking personal preferment at the expense of national interest.

On this premise, which impugns the integrity and honesty of all U.S. political leadership, Arab propagandists have bolstered their hope that America would some day abandon Israel. It has been a propaganda tactic calculated to embarrass Americans into diminution or disavowal of their support for Israel. Americans have tended to brush this petty polemic aside.

But a tactic based on malicious distortion can be escalated into taunts, threats, intimidation and, finally, terror.

Perhaps the tragedy of these days may bring about a sober reassessment, a reconsideration of irresponsible propaganda tactics which defame the American people and our political leadership.

There is some hope for this.

Responsible Arab diplomats here and in their home capitals have been swift to deplore Sirhan's role in Kennedy's death and to repudiate him. He is not acclaimed as an Arab patriot, if that was his ambition. A Lebanese workman has said that he would do better by enlisting in the *El Fatah*, the terrorist organization (which kills Israelis, not Americans).

In Amman last Sunday, King Hussein said the assassination had left him "most deeply shocked and nauseated," that Senator Ken-

nedy was "a friend" and a person he admired, and that there was nothing to suggest that the assassination was anything more than an individual act by a young man whose "contact with this part of the world ended when he left here as a child."

[Hussein himself has been the object of many assassination attempts. He listed 13 in his autobiography in 1962. He was a witness in 1951 when his grandfather, King Abdullah, was murdered because, it was claimed, he had been willing to make peace with Israel. Indeed, it is often said that Hussein and other Arab leaders might have reached accord with Israel long ago if not for the fear of assassination.]

In contrast with Hussein's responsible reaction to the shooting, there is a rabid fringe which, as always, blames the Zionists for a plot to undermine Arab-U.S. relations.

Four years ago, some Arab publications (e.g. the *Scribe*, published in Cairo) were insisting that President Kennedy was the victim of the Zionists—as were Lincoln and McKinley!

Now in the same anti-Semitic fantasy, the Beirut daily *Al Kifah* has claimed that the assassination was a Jewish plot to keep Kennedy from the White House where "he would have discovered that the Jews were behind the murder of President Kennedy."

We would like to believe that such preposterous ranting is the view of an insignificant lunatic fringe. There are saner voices in the Arab world.

Hate propaganda and terrorism do not respect or recognize boundaries and they can travel fast and far in this time of swift communication.

We recall the frightening rise of anti-Semitism in America and in other lands—including the Arab countries—in the 1930s, when the noxious Nazi poison began to spread across frontiers and around the world. (Sirhan's father last week recalled that his son often said that he admired Hitler.)

No one dreamed when Hitler seized power in 1933 that many millions would be doomed by his preachment.

We need to do more—so much more—to combat hate incitement everywhere, for it spreads everywhere. We cannot be indifferent or neutral on issues involving life and death, peace and war, tyranny and freedom. We cannot live in dignity with the cynical doctrine that foreign and domestic policies must be determined by material and security interests and drained of moral consideration.

We look forward to the day when Jew and Arab may sit together in cooperation and peace. That is what Senator Kennedy was urging. And that is what his martyrdom may yet bequeath to humanity.

REMEDY FOR OUR ECONOMIC ILLS

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in these days of the new economics it is not often that we are reminded of the basic economic principles which lie at the foundation of our national economy. Accordingly, when Mr. Fred C. Foy, chairman of Koppers Co., and former chairman of the National Export Expansion Council, spoke recently to the International Trade Club of Chicago, it was refreshing to note the depth and clarity of his analysis.

Mr. Foy stated emphatically that con-

fidence in the American dollar and hope for the future of our national economy can be assured only through willingness on our part to spend no more than we are willing to collect in taxes from the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. Foy's eloquent and perceptive remarks appeared in summary in the June 24 issue of the *Chicago Tribune*. They are as follows:

U.S. ECONOMIC ILLS CAUSE FOR WORRY

(NOTE.—Excerpts from a recent talk by Fred C. Foy, chairman of Koppers company and former chairman of the National Export Expansion Council, at a meeting of the International Trade Club of Chicago.)

I'm worrying.

The finance minister of Eurotania, which is no country at all and almost every major country, is worried.

Some of you may be worried.

We're worried because the United States has a pain in its balance of payments and because it's hurting too much to be ignored.

We're worried because, like most pain, it is a symptom. But we're even more worried because some of the doctors who are treating it seem unclear on their diagnosis and inclined to treat what may be cancer with aspirin.

Let's take a look at what we're worrying about, the finance minister and I.

He sits in his office, let's say somewhere in Europe. He is interested in dollars because the dollar is the currency of the strongest and largest economy in the world. He is interested also because the buying power of the dollar has been sustained and with more stability than any other currency in the world, and lastly because it is the key currency in the international exchange system, and can be converted into gold at \$35 an ounce.

But most of all he is concerned because his country has a lot of dollars and he has the responsibility of deciding what to do with them.

Here are some of the things he is worrying about:

Because of a series of years in which more dollars have left the United States than have come back, the total of liquid dollars owned by other countries and their citizens has grown from 13 billion dollars in 1956 to 33 billions today.

While the United States has stated that it will convert dollars into gold at \$35 an ounce at the request of another government, we have as of today less than 11 billions in gold, or about one-third of all the dollars held abroad that could be converted to gold.

So the finance minister knows that if this happened, he would still be left with two-thirds of his dollars.

But he knows some other things. He knows that the real value of the dollar is not that 35 of them can be exchanged for an ounce of gold but in what they will buy in goods and services.

He knows, too, that gold is expensive to store and to guard and that it earns no interest, whereas liquid dollar holdings are just the opposite.

He realizes that if he were sure that the purchasing power of the dollar were to remain constant, he would rather have currency than convert it to gold.

But he worries about some other things.

He wonders why the United States continues policies which pump more dollars out each year than the rest of the world has been able to use.

And because he has had more experience with inflation than we, he is deeply concerned with the fact while, in his 1968 economic report, the President of the United States pointed to seven years of "the longest and strongest expansion in our history," in not one of these years did the government live within its income.

He is concerned because our total cash budget deficit during those seven years was 40 billions.

And he must have an uneasy feeling that somehow there is lack of realism in even the richest country in the world announcing to its citizens and all others who will listen that it can fight an undeclared war at a cost of more than 25 billions a year while at the same time embarking on new spending programs at home costing twice that much.

So, he worries—and he has a legitimate right to worry;—and a right to be critical of United States fiscal policies—because the economy of his own country has now become inexorably tied to the soundness of the dollar.

As for me, I'm helping him worry. What should we be doing?

Our friend the finance minister and his counterparts want to see; more of what we will do to evaluate and control our extensive international commitments; more action on spending cuts and tax increases; in short, more taking of the bitter medicine of restraint to attack the cancer of inflation.

Why do they feel this way? Do they have any right to tell us what to do? Do they, in fact, know what they are talking about?

Asked these questions, they would reply by saying, "We've taken the cure."

"Since the war we have swallowed the bitter medicine of restraint. To control the cancer of inflation, to bring our own balance of payments under control, we have used unpopular but necessary fiscal and monetary restraints."

These cures worked with surprising vigor and speed in West Germany, in Italy, in Japan, and in France. And the reasons why they worked are perfectly clear.

Yet, unlike the governments of other industrial countries, our government has consistently refused voluntarily to take the medicine of fiscal and monetary restraint in order to help overcome our balance of payments problem, because a dose of such medicine, in the official view, would cause an unacceptable slowdown in the pace of our economy.

Recently I asked a small but experienced and highly influential group of European bankers and business men this question:

What would be the reaction if the government of the United States announced that henceforth whatever it believed its level of expenditures must be, it would no longer spend any more than it was willing to tax its citizens currently to pay for?"

The answer came forth loud and clear. No single action we could take would do more to restore confidence in the dollar because such an action would set in motion a train of events which would lead to a halt in progress toward inflation, as well, in a short period of time, to halt in a substantial part of the outflow of dollars from the United States.

WILL A GUN BILL ACCOMPLISH IT?

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Farmington Valley Herald, one of New England's finest weekly newspapers, has just presented his readers with an objective and penetrating analysis of the gun-control question.

Mr. Lou Ball's unemotional approach to this controversial issue deserves the attention and consideration of my colleagues and with permission I place his editorial at this point in the RECORD:

WILL A GUN BILL ACCOMPLISH IT?

Within hours of the shooting of Senator Kennedy, the familiar outcry for the passage of a "gun control bill" arose again, this time with the added support of a considerable segment of the public, outraged by the senseless shooting of Senator Kennedy and frustrated by an apparent lack of alternatives for something positive to do. President Johnson himself, in a passionate and heated message to the American people, demanded passage of a gun control bill, denied any "sickness in America," and then named a Commission to study the causes of violence in America, and to recommend measures to eliminate or reduce this creeping blot.

It is entirely possible that by the time these lines reach print and your eyes, we will have a gun bill enacted and signed into law. Whether or not it is now the law of the land, is not really fundamentally important, because no gun control bill that Congress could pass will accomplish what many of its advocates hope to do: eliminate assassinations, murders, assaults with deadly weapons, and senseless shootings. Somewhere along the way, we seem to have forgotten that a gun or firearm, whether it is an antique rifle, a surplus bazooka or a modern riot gun, is simply an instrument, and regardless of its potential, becomes a deadly weapon inflicting death or damage only in the hands of someone using it, either by accident, design or criminal intent.

In other words, the Federal government can ban the mail order sale, the possession and even the manufacture of guns, and as long as the government itself provides military arms for its troops, or guns for its law enforcement agencies, then the nuts, the criminals, the gangsters and any others who want a gun for one reason or another will have them.

It seems to us that there is a useful lesson to be learned from the U.S. Constitution, besides the clause which protects the right of the people to keep arms, and that is the Eighteenth Amendment, known in the old days as the Volstead Act, which prohibited liquor and failed so miserably that it was repealed shortly thereafter. It attempted then, as a gun control bill now attempts, to control the public's morals through a form of prohibition, focusing its attention on an effect, or an object, and neglecting to get into the basic causes to correct an omission in the American character.

In this instance, however, there are several factors which could enhance the chances of succeeding in the reduction of crimes of violence where deadly weapons are used. First, America has become a country of urban sophisticates, where the protection of a firearm, or its utility in providing food, is far less important than when the Constitution was framed. Secondly, the mass of American people are shocked and outraged, particularly with the succession of political assassinations of the past five years, and the vast majority believe that a reduction in the accessibility of dangerous weapons might reduce the instances of violent assault. Third, the President has named a blue ribbon commission to study the causes of violence and to make recommendations.

With respect to the first factor, that of protection and subsistence, the need for firearms should be minimal. With better police protection, particularly in the cities, and with licensing procedures, the need for armed protection could be controlled much better than it is. With collectors, gun fanciers, and die-hards who will oppose further erosions of Constitutional guarantees, a more realistic approach to ownership and the sale of weapons than has been evidenced in any of the bills proposed would find lessened opposition. Indeed, the "gun bugs" would likely support the prohibition of the sale of bazookas, cannon and other heavy military weaponry, unless effectively and per-

manently disarmed, so that 'collections' for historical interest could be preserved. The mail order sale of reproduction flintlock and percussion weapons is a case in point. The collectors would not be hampered, the antique gun shooter permitted to continue, if the present laws were continued, while there hasn't been a case of murder involving a Colonial flintlock or a Civil War percussion in many, many years.

With regard to the second factor, the American public is not so concerned with the sale, ownership or manufacture of guns as it is with the misuse of these firearms. Its outcry for a gun bill is out of desperation for a way to stop senseless killing, and thus far, it has been given no alternative that appears to have definite hope for success. Sadly, we don't believe this gun bill is going to be any more effective than their hopes.

In the third instance, President Johnson's motivation and his selection of a commission are both laudable, but if it gets as little attention or support as the Commission on Civil Disorders got with its highly explicit Report, then the commission should not waste its time, or arouse the hopes of the American people.

It's about time the Congress opened its eyes to the roots of the problem, part of which was pounded home time and time again in the Report on Civil Disorders, and parts of which have been symptomized in campus rebellions, the intellectual disaffections with the quality of American life, and the growing schisms which rent America. It would be too much to expect the Congress, the Executive Branch, or the American people to solve this or these problems in a short time, or with simple legislation. But since all three hope to reduce or eliminate one important phase of this total problem with a "gun control bill," it's about time all addressed themselves to the most obvious means to accomplish this end: the control of those who use and abuse firearms and other dangerous weapons in crimes, from the assassination of a President down to the corner brawl or armed robbery.

Let us begin by restoring meaning to the words "crime" and "punishment," by restoring the protections for innocent people which have been stripped off and given to criminals by returning the criminal element to its former position of aversion; by putting meaningful resolution behind Crime Commissions and exposures of criminal operations; and by putting stringent and specific penalties upon those who use and abuse guns or dangerous weapons against others.

The Congress could begin by making the use of guns or dangerous weapons in the commission of a crime a federal offense, punishable on the first offense by five years' imprisonment, ten years for the second offense, twenty for third, and life for the fourth. The federal government reduced the incidence of kidnaping substantially after Bruno Richard Hauptmann encouraged the Congress to make kidnaping a capital offense, later seeing kidnaping increase after it relaxed its prosecutions.

The Supreme Court could begin by giving the majority equal time with Miranda, and by recognizing that there are two rights within the phrase "the rights of an individual within society:" those of the individual and those of the rest of the people in society, and by restoring the right to protection of those living under the law within a society.

The American people could begin by removing the adulation it gives criminals, and by substituting aversion, such as it should have given "Bonnie and Clyde," far more ruthless and accomplished murderers than this despicable person who killed Senator Kennedy.

The Executive Branch could begin by a vigorous prosecution of the thugs, killers, and bandits who have been exposed at least since 1952 as menaces. It could do something about the Civil Disorders Report for a starter,

and the Attorney General's office could score its "first," if we look only at the three assassins who murdered President Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Senator Robert Kennedy.

A "gun control" bill won't do it, because we never have been able to push off our problems for someone else to solve, and chances are, we never will. The solution lies within each of us, beginning with respect for law, and with the vigorous prosecution of those who flout the laws under which all of us hope to live.

**"MR. DEMOCRAT" AT 80, A KEEN
EYE ON POLITICS**

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle recently printed an article on the elder statesman of the Democratic Party, James A. Farley. Mr. Farley, who just celebrated his 80th birthday, will be in attendance at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago this year—his 12th convention. Few people are as qualified as Mr. Farley to discuss politics and the Democratic Party, and his views as recorded in the article make fascinating and enlightening reading. It was of particular interest to me because James Farley is a friend of many years, and I know my colleagues will enjoy reading it as well. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the article:

**"MR. DEMOCRAT" AT 80, A KEEN EYE ON
POLITICS**

(By James L. Kilgallen)

NEW YORK.—The presidential race is in full swing and nobody is more interested in it than the elder statesman of the Democratic Party who celebrates his 80th birthday next Thursday.

James A. Farley said he "feels fine" and is looking forward to attending the Democratic convention in Chicago.

"It will be my twelfth convention," he remarked.

Then Mr. Democrat explained another enthusiasm:

"I'm for Humphrey. He's the logical man to succeed President Johnson."

STILL HAS TOUCH

From the beginning of the interview, it was clear that his 28 years as a corporation executive (he is chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corp.) have not impaired his political touch.

The mastermind of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first two campaigns for the presidency noted that politics has "changed tremendously" in recent years and that the biggest change has been brought about by television.

"TV gives the candidates complete exposure," he said. "This has been helpful to some candidates, detrimental to others. The personality and 'image' have become important factors in vote-getting."

"Today radio and TV reporters interview candidates all along the campaign trail and the public gets a fine chance to size them up from what they say and how they act."

"Greeting crowds and hand-shaking around the country always have helped the candidates. They must be careful not to slight people along the way. But the party organization and leaders must cooperate in (1) get-

ting the citizens to register and (2) getting them out to the polls on election day."

Farley foresees the possibility that this year U.S. political conventions will have to be streamlined if they want to obtain maximum coverage.

HIGH SPOTS

"The political parties may have to arrange to spot the most dramatic happenings for the TV's night audiences," he said.

I asked Farley, who is famous for his phenomenal memory, to name the high spots of his own political career. He listed them thoughtfully:

"My election as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee in 1930.

"My election in 1932 as chairman of the Democratic National Committee following FDR's nomination.

"My appointment as Postmaster General in 1933.

"Election night in 1936 when my prophecy was confirmed that Roosevelt would carry every state but Maine and Vermont.

"Sitting under the platform at the 1940 convention in Chicago—with tears in my eyes—when my name was presented in nomination for the Presidency. This was when I was opposing Mr. Roosevelt's running for a third term. I was not a candidate and knew there was no chance that I would be nominated. It gave delegates a chance to vote for Vice President John N. Garner, another third term opponent, whose name also had been placed in nomination."

NO COLLEGE

Farley, who never attended college because he had to go to work to support his mother after his father had died, added one more "high spot."

"I shall always be grateful to the 24 colleges that honored me with a degree," he said. "But I don't know of any honor from the field of education that give me a more genuine sense of fulfillment than when the North Rockland Junior High School was named for me at Stoney Point, N.Y., where I was born and raised."

Farley said the men who had "most impressed" him during his political career were Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Vice President Garner, President Truman, Sen. Carter Glass, and Lyndon B. Johnson—whom he first met in 1934.

Asked for his views on pre-convention primaries, he replied:

"Primaries can be very important to the candidates. The primaries enable them to show their strength by discussing the issues and to become better known. Party leaders are impressed by the primary returns."

VIEW ON POLLS

On public opinion polls he said:

"These polls have demonstrated they are reasonably accurate and of interest to the public, though they sometimes are off several points in their figures. The polls never caught up with the switch in favor of Truman in the 1948 election."

Farley appears to be in excellent physical condition. He lives in the Waldorf Towers and walks to his office daily.

Farley's wife, Elizabeth, died Jan. 14, 1955. But his married son, two married daughters and his 10 grandchildren will be with him on his birthday.

SEX EDUCATION FAD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the present promotion of compulsory education in

sex of our children from age five to high school seeks justification on the basis of improvement of society.

Yet a moral degeneracy, sex crimes, and illegitimacy rates would deny any success from sex education and suggest the opposite—that sex education by untrained instructors is contributing to the cause, instead of bringing about a cure.

We might be amazed to learn how few parents are aware that the "filthy books" have been promoted from the corner bookstore to be made respectable by being called "education" for our kids.

What next to punish the human race?

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Capell's Herald of Freedom in the RECORD followed by a current article by John Kobler from the Saturday Evening Post:

[From the Herald of Freedom, June 14, 1968]

A LOOK AT SEX EDUCATION

Sex and Communism are involved in the personnel of a fairly new organization with an impressive board of directors and high-sounding purposes. One of the main targets of its "educating" process is the youth of America which is always a fertile field for such organizations which operate under a cloak of respectability, mixing innocent dogooders with not-so-innocent plotters. "A voluntary health organization," the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS), present address 1855 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10023, was established during 1964 and in full bloom beginning in 1965 to "create something new in the world: knowledge in depth, and attitudes in breadth, about that part of the human individual that is so central to his total well-being, his sexuality."

An article in The Tustin News (Tustin, Calif.) sounded a warning concerning this organization which is invading the schools and homes of America. It states:

"An organization which purports to 'dignify' man's sexuality has been charged with in fact exploiting it through members of its own board of directors."

"Tustin Elementary District Coordinating Council composed of the presidents of the district's parent-teacher organizations, was presented information linking some members of the Sex Information Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) to a 50-cent magazine which has been labeled 'pure trash' by at least one nationally known college administrator."

"In referring to 'Sexology,' a paperback magazine which contains 'frank and authoritative sex guidance,' Mrs. Arthur Vandenberg, last year's council president, declared, 'It would seem to me that despite one of SIECUS' expressed purposes being to keep 'sexuality' from being exploited, this is exactly what its board members are doing. . . ."

"Mrs. Vandenberg pointed to the fact that two editors of the 'Sexology' magazine as well as two members of the 'board of consultants' are also members of the SIECUS board of directors. . . ."

Mrs. Vandenberg listed such prurient titles of articles appearing in Sexology as: "Alcohol Can Solve Sex Problems," "Group Sex Orgies," "My Wife Knows I'm Homosexual," and "Gangs That Hunt Down Queers," and asks the question: "These are 'educational acts'?" In the latest issue of Sexology (June 1968) are such titles as: "My Most Unusual Sex Case" by Wardell B. Pomeroy (of both Sexology and SIECUS), "Wife Objects to Foreplay," "What Couples Don't Know About Lovemaking" and "The Many Ways to Ask for Sex."

The "respectable" half of the Sexology—SIECUS partnership was announced to the public January 8, 1965 although the organization received its charter in May of 1964

and began its "functions" on July 1, 1964. Writing about "SIECUS: Its Present and Its Future" in Vol. I, No. 2, of the SIECUS Newsletter, Mary S. Calderone, M.D., M.P.H. Executive Director, states:

"The SIECUS Board and Executive Committee have met often and actively, and have assumed full responsibility for programs and policies. The work of the organization is still carried on by a single professional, the Executive Director, with 4½ secretarial employees and two volunteers. . . .

"Members of the Board and the Executive Director have been participating in many meetings, symposia, and teaching sessions. . . .

"The Executive Director has been providing consultant services in the production of the films, film strips, the preparation of programs, etc., in the field.

"On June 1, 1965 SIECUS was given a grant of \$25,000 by The Commonwealth Fund, which will be doubled if the organization can raise its year's basic budget by May 31, 1966. A grant of \$10,000 from another foundation is already in hand towards this goal. . . ."

As of that time the officers of the organization were as follows: Wallace C. Fulton, M.P.H., President; George Packer Berry, M.D., Vice-President; Rev. William H. Genne, B.D., M.A., Secretary; Isadore Rubin, Ph.D., Treasurer; and Mary S. Calderone, M.D., M.P.H., Executive Director. David R. Mace, Ph.D., replaced Fulton as President with the other officers remaining the same. As of February 1968 the letterhead of SIECUS lists the officers as: Lester L. Doniger, President; Immediate Past President, David R. Mace, Ph.D.; Vice Presidents, Jesse Bernard, Ph.D., Harold I. Lief, M.D., J. Noel Macy; Secretary, Fr. George Hagmaier, C.S.P., Ed. D.; Treasurer, Isadore Rubin, Ph.D.; Executive Director, Mary S. Calderone, M.D., M.P.H. So we see that, as others have come and gone in the higher echelons of SIECUS, Isadore Rubin and Mary Calderone remain in their top positions.

Dr. Mary Calderone as Executive Director would appear to be the person who is running the organization. She is described in an article by Alton Blakeslee, Associated Press Science Writer, as a "gray-haired, vivacious grandmother." She was born in New York, N.Y., July 1, 1904, the daughter of Edward J. Steichen and the former Clara Smith. Her father is the well-known photographer and her uncle was the famous poet, Carl Sandburg, both darlings of the left.

Mary Steichen graduated from Vassar with a B.A. degree in 1925, from the University of Rochester Medical School with a M.D. degree in 1939, and in 1942 was awarded an M.S. degree in Public Health by the Columbia University School of Public Health. On March 27, 1941 Mary married Dr. Frank A. Calderone and they have three daughters, Linda Martin (now Mrs. Stuart Hodes), Francesca, and Maria.

Dr. Mary S. Calderone was first an intern at Bellevue Hospital, New York City, from 1939 to 1940, and then became a health officer in training from 1940 to 1942. She was next employed by the American Public Health Association from 1942 to 1943 in their Testing Service Division. Her next employment listed in her biography is as a school physician for Great Neck, N.Y. public schools from 1950 to 1953, after which she became Medical Director of the Planned Parenthood Association in which position she remained until she became involved in the creation of SIECUS.

Mary's husband, Dr. Frank A. Calderone, was formerly Deputy Commissioner of Health of the City of New York and for four years was Chief Administrator of the World Health Organization (under the auspices of the United Nations) the head of which has been Dr. Brook Chisholm whose radical ideas and beliefs have been well publicized.

Dr. Mary Calderone attracted national at-

tention through her work as Medical Director of the Planned Parenthood Association and made many contacts as a result. Informants in the Great Neck area, familiar with the activities of both Doctors Calderone, describe them as "ultra-liberal one-worlders." Stronger words can be used to describe Mary's close associate in the growth and operation of SIECUS, Dr. Isadore Rubin, the treasurer.

Dr. Isadore Rubin was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Mrs. Mildred Blauvelt in public testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on May 3, 1955. Mrs. Mildred Blauvelt was a detective of the New York City Police Department who was an undercover operative for the New York Police Department from April 1943 until November 1951, during which time she was assigned to several different Communist Party groups within the New York area. From her sworn testimony we take the following excerpts:

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Blauvelt, at the time of the recess we were discussing the Flatbush Club of the Communist Party. Will you name those persons whom you can, of your own knowledge, identify as members of the Communist Party within that group?

Mrs. BLAUVELT. Yes. If I am able to do so, I certainly will. I have prepared this list alphabetically so that in the course of it we will come across some of the comrades who were the functionaries of the club and those that were more active.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When you speak of clubs, are you referring to clubs of the Communist Party?

"Mrs. BLAUVELT. That is right; yes sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. And when you are referring to persons having attended meetings with you, are you referring to Communist Party meetings?

"Mrs. BLAUVELT. Yes, in this instance it would be meetings of the Flatbush Club of the Communist Party."

Mrs. Blauvelt then continued reading her list.

"Isadore Rubin, R-u-b-i-n. In March of 1945 while he was in the Army in Italy, he sent \$10 to the party's fund drive. Upon his return from service, he did attend some of the meetings of the Flatbush Club. Now, there was a club bulletin issued under date of November 28, 1944, which gave his name and listed his address as 1030 Ocean Avenue, with the notation that he was the winner of an essay contest which had been conducted while he was in the Army. Isadore Rubin was a teacher in the New York City school system who was dismissed in 1951, after trial.

"I did read some testimony which he had presented to the Senate Committee on Internal Security in September of 1952. At that time he gave his address as 20 Rugby Road, and it was in connection with the teachers union, I believe, that these hearings were being held; and I was particularly interested in reading the testimony because he invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment concerning his Communist affiliations.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me the April 23, 1955 issue of New York Teachers News, and apparently published by the Teachers Union of New York.

"Mrs. BLAUVELT. That is correct.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I notice the name of the editor appears on the editorial board and staff of this issue. Will you examine this issue and state what you see to be the name of the editor?

"Mrs. BLAUVELT. The name of the editor is Isadore Rubin.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the same person to whom you have referred?

"Mrs. BLAUVELT. Yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. As having been known to you as a member of the Communist Party?

"Mrs. BLAUVELT. Yes, sir, it is the same person. . . ."

The Teachers Union referred to by Mr.

Tavener and Mrs. Blauvelt was expelled from the AFL-CIO because it was found to be Communist-controlled. Isadore Rubin worked for this union after he was dismissed from the New York City public school system by the board of education. He testified concerning this before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on September 8, 1952, the testimony being contained in the report entitled, "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process." Starting on Page 146 we read: "Testimony of Isadore Rubin, Brooklyn, N.Y., accompanied by his attorneys, Harold I. Cammer and Royal W. France. . . .

"Mr. MORRIS. Will you give your full name and address to the reporter.

"Mr. RUBIN. Isadore Rubin, 20 Rugby, Brooklyn.

"Mr. MORRIS. Are you a school teacher?

"Mr. RUBIN. I was trained as a school teacher. At the present time I am not teaching.

"Mr. MORRIS. What are you doing at the present time?

"Mr. RUBIN. At the present time I am employed by the teachers union.

"Mr. MORRIS. What do you do for the teachers union?

"Mr. RUBIN. I handle publications, the newspaper and some forms of publicity.

"Mr. MORRIS. Now, when did you terminate your teaching career?

"Mr. RUBIN. Well, I didn't terminate it. The board of education terminated it in February 1951, I believe.

"Mr. MORRIS. On what grounds was it terminated by the board of education?

"Mr. RUBIN. On the grounds that I had refused to permit them to inquire into my political beliefs and associations by declining to answer any questions about such affiliations. . . .

"Mr. MORRIS. Are you a member of the executive committee of the Teachers Union?

"Mr. RUBIN. I am.

"Mr. MORRIS. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. RUBIN. I understand that I was summoned here to testify as the editor of Teacher's News. I am perfectly willing to answer any questions concerning the newspaper, but I am not willing to answer such questions, because I believe that they are not proper, despite the fact that this is a Senate committee, or perhaps, because it is a Senate committee, and I have a very high regard for the Congress of the United States, and also for its Constitution.

"It is my feeling especially that as an editor of a paper, I should not permit any kind of inquiry, because it would interfere with freedom of the press, and also with other freedoms which are associated with it. . . .

"Senator FERGUSON. Do you refuse to answer and, if so, what is the reason?

"Mr. RUBIN. My basic reason is that it violates my rights, under the first amendment. . . .

"Senator FERGUSON. . . . we do not recognize it as reason for not answering questions.

"Mr. RUBIN. Not being a lawyer, it would seem to me that the express provisions of the first amendment would forbid such inquiry. But, since apparently the first amendment in some respects has been nullified, I will have to make use of the fifth amendment, which I understand was put there to prevent such inquiry and protect the innocent from such legislation and such inquiry."

An article in the N.Y. Herald Tribune of Oct. 20, 1948 stated:

"Abraham Lederman, president of a New York City teachers' union, refused today to tell a House committee if he is or ever had been a member of the Communist party. . . .

"Three other witnesses who, like Mr. Lederman, had been subpoenaed by the committee, testified that they are not and never had been members of the party.

"They were Max Diamond. . . , Homer Sloane. . . , and Isadore Rubin, a member of Local 555's executive board.

"Messrs. Lederman, Diamond and Rubin are teachers in the New York City school system."

Isadore Rubin now resides at 641 Vanderbilt St., Brooklyn, N.Y., Apartment 5C where he has lived since 1965. He is the editor of the magazine *Sexology* which is published monthly by *Sexology Corp.* at 200 Park Ave. S., New York, N.Y. M. Harvey Gernsback is president of this corporation, Mary Gernsback, 1st vice president, and Dr. I. Rubin, 2nd vice president. The magazine was founded in 1933 by Hugo Gernsback and devoted to "frank and authoritative sex guidance."

Dr. Rubin, who obtained his Ph.D. late in life, is treasurer and a member of the executive board of SIECUS. Another editor of *Sexology* who has been on the Board of Directors of SIECUS from the beginning is Lester A. Kirkendall, Ph.D., Professor Family Life, Oregon State University and former consultant, U.S. Office of Education. He is the author of "Sex Education as Human Relations" and "Premarital Intercourse and Interpersonal Relationships," and is the "Parent Guidance" editor of *Sexology*.

Among those listed as the Board of Consultants of *Sexology* are the Rev. William H. Genne, Dr. John Money and Dr. Wardell B. Pomeroy, all of whom are on the Board of Directors of SIECUS.

Rev. William H. Genne, B.D., M.A. is a co-founder of SIECUS and in 1966 was their national secretary. He is Coordinator, Commission on Marriage and Family of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and the author of "Husbands and Pregnancy." A report dated May 22, 1968 of "Information from the Files of the Committee on Un-American Activities-U.S. House of Representatives" on the subject of Rev. William H. Genne shows the following Communist fronts with which he has been involved:

1949 Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (C-1951; I-1956). Signer of its Statement Calling for International Agreement to Ban Use of Atomic Weapons (Statement attached to press release of December 14, 1949, p. 15).

1950 World Peace Appeal (C-1951; S-1957). Endorser (Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, August 21, 1950, p. 8; undated leaflet, "Prominent Americans Call for Outlawing Atomic Warfare," received September 11, 1950).

1951 National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act (I. 1956). Signer of its Open Letter to Congress calling for the repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950 (Letterhead, January 19, 1951).

Dr. John Money (Ph.D.) is Associate Professor of Medical Psychology & Pediatrics at Johns Hopkins University and full-time research scientist in medical psychology, as well as editor of "Sex Research-New Developments," according to his listing in *Sexology*.

Dr. Wardell B. Pomeroy (Ph.D.) is a psychotherapist and marriage counselor in New York City and former associate of the late Dr. Kinsey. From 1943 to 1963 Pomeroy was director of field research of the Institute for Sex Research, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. He was co-author with Kinsey and others of "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male," "Sexual Behavior in the Human Female," (Kinsey Reports) and other books. In the June 1968 issue of *Sexology* he describes "My Most Unusual Sex Case" with the subtitle: "Introduced to intercourse by his grandmother and to homosexuality by his father, this man literally tried everything."

The current president of SIECUS is Lester L. Doniger, a publisher. He is listed in *Who's Who in Commerce and Industry* (1968) as born in Raczk, Poland, 10/15/09, son of Morris Doniger and Celia Jalkut. He came to the United States in 1920 graduated from N.Y.U. in 1931 and married Rita Roth in

1939. He was publisher-editor of *The Pulpit Digest*, director of the *Pulpit Book Club* and president of the *Pulpit Press*. He is listed as having been involved in Protestant Church Administration, president of the Great Neck Board of Education, president of the Religious Book Club, Inc. and with the Book Club Guild, Inc.

In the 1965 edition of *Who's Who in World Jewry*, Lester Doniger, publisher, appears as the son of Moses Doniger (rather than Morris) and no reference is made to his publishing Protestant publications. In earlier editions of *Who's Who in the East* Mr. Doniger gave his place of birth as Vienna, Austria as compared with Raczk, Poland which appears in *Who's Who in World Jewry* and *Who's Who in Commerce and Industry*.

The Great Neck Record of March 3, 1968 showed Lester Doniger of Wildwood Drive, Great Neck, as chairman of the North Shore Community Arts Center Building Fund Drive. The Great Neck Tribune of February 20, 1960 stated that Great Neck Arts Center had presented as entertainers Pete Seeger (identified as a Communist according to published reports) and Carl Sandburg (uncle of Mary Calderone) who had a long history of affiliations with communist-fronts. The Great Neck News of February 14, 1947 carried an article entitled "US-USSR Committee Announces Meeting" which stated that a forum would be held under the auspices of the Great Neck Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. Among those scheduled to appear was Jessica Smith, wife of Communist John Abt and widow of Communist Hal Ware, and editor of *Soviet Russia Today*. The article stated that tickets for the affair were available from Mrs. Rita Doniger, telephone Great Neck 1222.

SIECUS publishes a list of "Selected Reading in Education for Sexuality" for adults, children and young people. Listed on Page 7 of this listing is Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 366 entitled "Sex and Our Society" written by Lester A. Kirkendall with Elizabeth Ogg, and on page 16 is Public Affairs pamphlet No. 397, "Sexual Adjustment in Marriage" by Richard H. Klemer and Margaret G. Klemer.

Public Affairs Pamphlets are published by the Public Affairs Committee, Inc. of New York City, the editor of which for many years has been Maxwell S. Stewart, who was identified as a Communist in sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee by Louis Budenz.

Also listed as recommended reading are reprints of articles from *Sexology*, the book "Teenagers and Sex" by (retired) Episcopal Bishop James A. Pike, books that can be read by children age 4 and up, slides for children age 3-8, as well as Study Guides, written and edited by SIECUS Board members. These Study Guides are: 1) Sex Education by Lester A. Kirkendall; 2) Homosexuality by Isadore Rubin; 3) Masturbation by Warren H. Johnson; 4) Characteristics of Male and Female Sexual Responses by Wardell B. Pomeroy and Cornelia V. Christenson; 5) Premarital Sexual Standards by Ira L. Reiss; and 6) Sexual Relations During Pregnancy and the Post Delivery Period by S. Leon Israel and Isadore Rubin.

There is need for proper "sex education" but we question whether the kind of "education" one can get from the programs and publications of SIECUS is the proper kind. Local groups—school boards and personnel, PTA's, YWCA's and YMCA's, youth agencies, churches, health personnel, health and welfare agencies, family life consultants, all are being urged to get involved in sex education with a ready-made program available from the "experts" of SIECUS.

SIECUS uses material from Dr. Albert Ellis, Director of the Institute for Rational Living, Inc., who condones perversion, adultery and teen-age sex, premarital sex, author of "Sex

Without Guilt" and "The Case for Sexual Liberty." Its director Dr. Calderone is quoted as stating, "We are for the first time in history, at a point where man can separate his sexual life from his reproductive life."

Through the promotion of pornography, drug use and the "New Morality," the will to resist the International Communist Conspiracy is being weakened... "situation ethics" and the idea that there is no longer any "right" or "wrong" way to act, along with the downgrading of the influence of the family and religion play right into the hands of the Communists.

SEX INVADES THE SCHOOLHOUSE

(By John Kobler)

(NOTE.—The fastest-spreading new fad in American education is sex instruction, but its critics still ask: Should boys and girls be taught together? What ought the teachers to say about premarital intercourse? Contraception? Wouldn't it be better simply to scare the youngsters away from the whole subject?)

In San Diego, Calif., they are called "social-health teacher-counselors." Five of them—two men, three women—circulate among the city's 31 secondary schools, trying to promote "wholesome attitudes toward boy-girl relationships and respect for family life," in the words of Dr. G. Gage Wetherill, director of health services, who initiated the effort. The counselors carry from school to school big canvas bags containing classroom materials which, not so very long ago, would have scandalized the community and even invited prosecution. The materials include literature, charts, models, tapes and films dealing in explicit terms with such formerly taboo subjects as sexual anatomy, masturbation, homosexuality and premarital intercourse. The counselors, however, shock hardly anybody. They go their rounds with the majority approval not only of school administrators but also of local physicians, clergymen, civic leaders and the PTA. "Though the program is optional," Dr. Wetherill reports, "we have ninety-nine percent parental consent."

As she threads a film entitled *The Game* into a projector, a young counselor named Mrs. Persida Drakulich matter-of-factly announces to the 40 girls in one ninth-grade class at Pershing Junior High, "You're going to see how a boy feels after intercourse with a virgin."

Her listeners are predominantly from white middle-income families. There are four Negro and two Mexican girls. (Boys get the film too, usually under the guidance of a male counselor, but at a different time, it being San Diego school policy to segregate the sexes for sex education.)

"Pay lots of attention to the game they're playing," Mrs. Drakulich continued. "Do you know why they're playing it? And listen carefully to the words they use. 'Cherry' means what we call the hymen. That's what the boys in the film are referring to. You'll also hear one of them say, 'Did you bounce her high?' Not all boys talk or feel that way. Often the boy who talks big is insecure about his masculinity."

Lights out. Music. Peter, a high-school senior, who brags about his prowess as a seducer, is challenged by his companions to prove it. Let him try his wiles on his virginal classmate, Nicky. At first Nicky resists. But gradually she succumbs to flattery. Her downfall occurs in the back of a car borrowed from Peter's father. Afterward Peter, conscience-stricken and ashamed, avoids Nicky. She grows resentful and angry at herself for having ignored her girl friends' advice. Hadn't they warned her that Peter would drop her once he "scored"? The film ends with Peter's cronies vicariously enjoying his adventure.

During the remaining 20 minutes of class Mrs. Drakulich leads a "buzz session" about the moral implications of *The Game*. "Now what was really going on? Yes, Judy."

A blue-jeaned 14-year-old, her blond hair tumbling to her waist, ventures: "He didn't really want to go through with it."

Counselor beams. "Precisely. I've talked to boys who told me, 'I was hoping she'd say no.'"

Second girl: "I don't think that Nicky was really so innocent."

Mrs. Drakulich: "How many think she was enjoying the game? (Up go some 30 hands.) You remember when Peter phones and asks, 'What are you doing?' and Nicky tells him, 'I just got out of the tub.' She wanted him to picture her in the nude, didn't she? 'I'll be right over,' he says. Then she plays coy. 'Is that nice?' When he does arrive, why should she receive him in her bedroom, with her parents absent? Eventually she falls for the oldest line. 'You're laughing at me,' Peter says. So she has to show him she takes him seriously. . . . You have a question?"

Third girl: "Why does Peter always wear dark glasses, even when he's taking a bath?"

Mrs. Drakulich: "Can anybody answer that?"

Blue Jeans: "He's sort of hiding behind them."

Mrs. Drakulich: "Now consider the cultural influences on Peter and Nicky. The rock-'n'-roll music at the beach. Dancing in their swimsuits. The car—a car can be a mobile bed, you know. Weren't they both losers? The guilt, the shame? Why is Peter so dejected?"

A Mexican girl: "He's afraid she won't accept him any more."

Mrs. Drakulich: "How many think he'd like to have sexual intercourse with her again?"

Chorus (minus three or four dissenters): "NO!"

Mrs. Drakulich: "What will happen to them?"

Mixed reaction: "They'll drift apart" . . . "He's going back to her, and I'm so happy" . . . "She'll never speak to him again" . . . "They'll come back together, only relations will be like they should have been in the first place. . . ."

Mrs. Drakulich: "Remember, all boys don't behave and think the way they do in *The Game*. Some boys don't like the film at all. They're afraid you girls will get the wrong idea and suspect everything they say. . . ."

The bell interrupts. Class dismissed. One little girl lingers, shyly approaches the counselor. "I got a problem, ma'am, a real problem."

"Tell me about it, dear."

"There's this boy. He's seventeen. He wants to come see me alone at my house when my folks is workin'. I tell him no. So he says for me to come to his house. But his folks are away all day too."

"Do you know what he has in mind?"

"I know."

"Well, what's the problem?"

"I want to."

They talk for an hour. Mrs. Drakulich concludes, "You want to play the game of love; he wants to play the game of sex. But you're not ready for sex, and he's not ready for love. It's a trap."

Later the child sadly reports that she has stopped dating her pursuer. "I told him maybe we'd meet again when we was both ready."

"And what did he say?"

"He say, 'Quit talkin' to teachers.'"

San Diego's sex-education program comprises 17 lessons. They begin in the sixth grade at elementary school, where special teachers devote an hour a day for five days chiefly to the mechanics of reproduction. Among their audio-visual aids are colored slides depicting male and female genitalia, drawings tracing fetal growth, a Walt Disney animated cartoon, *The Story of Menstruation*, in which a maiden resembling Snow White symbolizes pubescent girlhood. The teachers also give chalkboard talks, mincing no words, about the formation of sperm, wet dreams, copulation. During the ensuing discussions

they undertake to answer all questions, however disconcerting, with total candor.

The youngsters hear no more about sex from the faculty until they reach ninth grade. Then the roving teacher-counselors conduct a series of six meetings (review of early lessons plus new material, on sex deviations, sex outside marriage, illegitimacy, venereal diseases, and the psychological dangers of promiscuity, on social attitudes toward sex, and on selecting a mate, on courtship and marriage and family responsibilities). Another three-year hiatus follows, then, in senior year, the counselors cover much the same topics again, but in slightly greater detail and depth.

This curriculum exemplifies what has recently become a major fad in American education. Though the San Diego program got under way 26 years ago, most of the others mushrooming all over the country are newer than the New Math, having been introduced within the last two or three years. America seems to have suddenly discovered an urgent need for universal sex education—from kindergarten through high school, some enthusiasts insist—and is galloping off in all directions at once to meet it.

Only a few years back the idea of teaching schoolchildren about sex would have aroused consternation among the public. "Not long ago they'd have hanged me from the nearest telephone pole for what I'm doing," says Superintendent Paul W. Cook of the Anaheim, Calif., Union High School District, which maintains one of the country's most publicized sex-education programs.

In Chicago, up to 1965, school biology students might scarcely have imagined, for all the teachers ever told them, that humans had a reproductive system. Plants and animals, yes, but when it came to people—awkward silence. The Board of Education prohibited any teaching about sex. Then, three years ago, the Illinois General Assembly, yielding to various pressures—especially that of the PTA—passed an act sanctioning a less squeamish policy. The next fall a pilot program was incorporated into the fifth-grade science units at 27 Chicago schools. When 3,200 students' parents were queried about having their children take the course, only 16 children's parents, most of them fundamentalists from the Appalachian hills, withheld their consent. The following year the program was extended to 114 more elementary schools and all the high schools. By 1970, according to present plans, sex education will have become routine for all grades in all 600 city schools.

For a time before 1955, several schools in the Miami area gave a course called Family Living. It had nothing to do with sex. The mere title, nevertheless, suggested to parents an encroachment upon their domain, and they angrily opposed the course. The animal pets which some schools collected, not for biology instruction, but simply to make the classroom seem friendlier, fell under suspicion. One principal recalls, "We couldn't even keep a pregnant rabbit around." Every copy of one biology textbook was withdrawn when the school board decided that a drawing of the female body revealed the internal reproductive organs in needless detail. The art instructor given the task of "purifying" this illustration complained to the principal, "I'm exhausted. I've just performed three hundred hysterectomies."

Nowadays, however, Miami parents by the thousands enthusiastically subscribe to the new doctrine. At suburban Coral Gables' Ponce de Leon Junior High, for example, seventh-, eighth- and ninth-graders anonymously submit in writing the questions about sex that they most want answered. Using the commonest questions, a surgeon, Dr. Beverly Jones, then delivers to the boys three earthy physiological talks peppered with cautionary advice ("Don't you and a girl go pairing off in a corner. It'll only lead to frustration.

You're not prepared for sex except as animals. Don't start a relationship you're not ready for"). Dr. Lynn Bartlett, a youth counselor, gives the girls three lectures based on their questions ("Should a girl kiss a boy on their first date? Certainly not. A kiss should be a token of affection, not a favor freely distributed. Going steady? It's too easy to slip into an overly close relationship").

The trend toward sex education in the schools is nationwide. Nearly 50 percent of all schools, including both public and private, parochial and nonsectarian, are already providing it, and at the present rate the figure will pass 70 percent within a year. Clergymen, including many Catholic priests, not only do not oppose sex education, they are often members of the local planning committees. The Federal Government has pledged financial aid: Last year the Department of Health, Education and Welfare awarded grants totaling \$1.5 million to support programs in 13 school districts.

As a result of all this pedagogical exuberance, a lusty new commercial market has come into being. From publishing firms big and small there pours forth a deluge of sex-education textbooks, teachers' manuals, laboratory kits, and the like. The publishing house of Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., has committed itself to a multimillion-dollar investment for the development of a kindergarten-through-12th-grade curriculum. Business-machine manufacturers, notably IBM, plan to produce elaborate audio-visual equipment. Television and motion-picture studios are grinding out footage for classroom use with about the same range of quality as that in the films intended for movie theaters or TV. Medical-supply companies offer plastic models illustrating human sex characteristics and the cycle of gestation. One polychrome number, costing \$500, comes with interchangeable male and female sex organs. And at the center of the whole vast and growing sex-education movement, advising school administrators, evaluating programs—praising some and condemning others—stands a new breed of specialist, the sex-education consultant.

As a general concept, sex education is hardly novel. From 1900 on, agencies like the Y.W.C.A., the Child Study Association, and the American Purity Alliance, were pressing for it. But with the exception of a few cautious ventures confined mainly to impairing the bare biological facts of life ("plumbing courses," in academic vernacular), their appeals failed. Most parents recoiled in horror. Today, on the contrary, it is the parents who speak out most strongly to urge the schools to provide sex education.

Parental panic, in fact, has given the revolution its main impetus. National statistics tell part of the story. Venereal diseases among teen-agers: over 80,000 cases reported in 1966, an increase of almost 70 percent since 1956—and unreported cases doubtless dwarf that figure. Unwed teen-age mothers: about 90,000 a year, an increase of 100 percent in two decades. One out of every three brides under 20 goes to the altar pregnant. Estimates of the number of illegal abortions performed on adolescents run into the hundreds of thousands. One of the findings that decided New York City's New Lincoln School to adopt sex education was a poll of its 11th-graders on their attitudes toward premarital intercourse: The majority saw nothing wrong with it. Teen-age marriages have risen 500 percent since World War II, and the divorce rate for such marriages is three times higher than the rate for marriages contracted after 21. Newspaper reports of dropouts and run-aways, of drug-taking, sexual precocity and general delinquency intensify the worries of parents.

But these evils are only the grosser symptoms of a widespread social upheaval. Communication between the generations has stalled ("Don't trust anyone over thirty"),

and moral values once accepted by children because Mom and Dad said so have given way to a morality of the relative ("What's right or wrong? It all depends on the particular situation, on the individual"). In addition, parents' own emotional conflicts, and their reluctance to recognize in their children the same drives they experienced during childhood, make it all but impossible for them to talk honestly to their children about sex.

In desperation parents turn to the schools, which often lack the competence to assume this responsibility. As one harassed school superintendent puts it, "We've inherited the job by default."

Among the organizations shaping the structure of American sex education, by far the most influential is *SEXUS* (pronounced "seek us"). The acronym stands for *Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.* Set up four years ago in New York City, privately financed and nonprofit, *SEXUS* defines as its goal—in the lofty, if somewhat fuzzy, language of its charter—"To establish man's sexuality as a health entity: to identify the special characteristics that distinguish it from, yet relate it to, human reproduction; to dignify it by openness of approach, study and scientific research designed to lead towards its understanding and its freedom from exploitation; to give leadership to professionals and to society, to the end that human beings may be aided towards responsible use of the sexual faculty and towards assimilation of sex into their individual life patterns as a creative and recreative force."

Fifty-two officers and directors pool their expertise as physicians, psychiatrists, sociologists, jurists, clergymen and editors. The council publishes a quarterly newsletter, expounding its philosophy and recommending films, books and articles in the sexology field; it reprints articles that it judges particularly valuable; and issues a reading list and a series of forthright "study guides" such as *Characteristics of Male and Female Sexual Responses and Sexual Relations During Pregnancy and the Post-Delivery Period*. In addition staff members tirelessly range the country, offering their expertise to communities and schools that want to start sex-education programs.

When *SEXUS* responds to an appeal for help, its first representative on the scene is usually Miss Frances Breed, a professional administrator previously attached to the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. She serves as a kind of advance agent, grappling with some of the preliminary organizational problems. Later comes Dr. Esther Schulz, a Ph.D. in education, who gets down to the specifics of what textbooks and audiovisual aids to acquire. At some point in between, the council's executive director, Dr. Mary Steichen Calderone, M.D., Quaker, Vassar alumna and for 11 years Planned Parenthood's medical director, may appear, with considerable fanfare, to preach the *SEXUS* gospel to representatives of the local power structure.

It is largely to Dr. Calderone's charm and dynamism that *SEXUS* owes its formidable influence. A sweet-faced, silvery-haired grandmother, with the evangelical fervor of Joan of Arc, she is a great persuader. Frequently, listeners who start by being hostile to the idea of public sex education end up as her confirmed disciples. To encourage candor, she avoids sexual euphemisms and has even been known, in all matriarchal dignity, to use four-letter words.

According to the dicta enunciated by the forceful doctor, "Everything that science knows about sex and sexuality, our children must have access to. . . . We must give full information. . . . The willingness to answer, to discuss any question no matter how distasteful, should be the emphasis." Contrary to the views of most child psychoanalysts,

Dr. Calderone holds that sex education should start in the nursery. Around the age of three the child should assimilate such knowledge, along with the correct terminology, as "The penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina." Kindergarten teachers should then impart additional clinical details. "If you tell five-year-olds that this [intercourse] is the way fathers and mothers reaffirm their love for each other, and that science and religion have made it possible for parents to choose when they will have a baby, you are teaching responsible parenthood, responsible sexuality, right in the kindergarten." By age 10 "at the latest" both boys and girls should have mastered "the factual aspects of reproduction. . . ."

With such a foundation built during their elementary-school years, Dr. Calderone claims, students will be ready to explore the total male-female relationship. "Sex is not just something you do in marriage, in bed, in the dark, in one position. . . . Sex is what it means to be a man or a woman." For children between 10 and 13 she prescribes required courses covering the family, interpersonal responsibilities, marriage, the disparate feelings of boys and girls and how to understand them; from 13 to 15, the family within society, the individual within marriage, birth control (regarding contraception, Dr. Calderone reiterates, "This is responsible parenthood, and even very young children can grasp it"). Due attention should be given to alcoholism, drug addiction, promiscuity, venereal diseases, broken homes, homosexuality ("Every boy in an urban environment is going to have a homosexual advance made to him, and therefore he should understand what it is and what his attitude about it and about himself should be, and how to handle it"); from 15 on, all social issues relating to sex, the techniques of dating and courtship, "the whole panorama of marriage."

As to sexual morality, Dr. Calderone is no absolutist. "Do's" and "don'ts," she believes, cannot be imposed on the young by fiat. They simply won't accept them. In her own moral code the key words are "exploitation" and "responsibility." Sex with no object except transient physical pleasure she scorns as the crassest exploitation of one's partner. A moral person considers the welfare not only of the opposite sex but also of family and society. Though Dr. Calderone feels that the odds against a responsible, meaningful sexual relationship outside marriage are overwhelming, she concedes the possibility. "But [before making any decision on the subject] young people should be given all information and help to make a good decision."

Discussing different sex-education programs, Dr. Calderone observes pragmatically, "You cannot go faster in the community than the community itself is willing to go. If the community will accept something at the fifth-grade level only, then that is the level at which to start. . . . We shall probably get farther if we allow any child whose parents seriously disapprove to be excused from those classes." Such accommodation, however, distresses her. "For too long," she complains, "we have listened to the vociferous minority."

Between the ideals professed by sex educators and the practical realities of the schoolroom lies a wide gap. The Anaheim Union High School District, with its highly touted "Family Life and Sex Education Course," involving about 32,000 teenagers, is a *SEXUS* show window. Here, *SEXUS* representatives collaborated with local planners. The registered nurse who supervises Family Life, Mrs. Sally R. Williams, also serves as a *SEXUS* director. Many other schools have modeled their programs on Anaheim's.

In line with *SEXUS* philosophy, Nurse Williams and Superintendent Cook agree that sex education can scarcely begin too soon. But on this point they are thwarted by the

fact that their authority extends only to the high schools, whereas Anaheim's elementary schools have not seen fit to develop a preparatory program. Consequently, sex education in school doesn't begin until seventh grade, or about age 13.

The course calls for at least 132 classroom periods during the six remaining years. It's all spelled out for the teacher's guidance in a 290-page manual. One wonders, however, how many ninth-graders are likely to swallow such "facts" as these presented to them under the headings. Fact One, Fact Two, Fact Three, etc.: "One of the chief reasons for having extramarital relationships is to impress friends. . . . In premarital sex relations there is usually little, if any, concern for the other. There is considerable evidence to prove that premarital sex relationships among young people—except where [they are] honestly engaged—are often dog-eat-dog propositions. . . ."

The manual also includes a number of warnings addressed to the teacher—for example, "It is not considered appropriate to have the class label the parts of the male and female anatomy on a diagram." Asked why not, when the illustrations in every biology textbook are labeled, Mrs. William replied, "It would upset the parents."

Deference to parental attitudes also explains why the Anaheim program, like many another, violates principles it claims to honor. "We won't try to impose moral standards," runs a common resolution. "We'll give our students the whole, true picture as a basis on which they can make their own decisions." Actually, the teacher's guidebook bristles with moralisms. They are implied or explicit in suggested tragic case histories to feed the youngsters, in recommended films and texts, in loaded questionnaires, true-false tests and self-evaluation charts. A great deal of the verbiage can be boiled down to the same commandment parents have always handed their children, the one word they really want the schools to pass on—"Abstain." To reinforce it, the same old scare techniques are resorted to—"One act of intercourse (even if it's your first mistake) can lead to an unwanted pregnancy."

Student reactions to Anaheim's program vary from "The best and most helpful course I've had," to "Some of the movies you have to sit through look so ancient they just make you laugh. How can you take the moral lesson seriously when the girls are wearing skirts down to their ankles?"

In Evanston, Ill., which also boasts a famous sex-education program, a junior-high-school teacher responds to the frequent question, "Why is premarital sex wrong?" by handing around a list of horrifying statistics on venereal disease, illegitimacy, abortion, and divorce.

One of the most forthright sex-education courses is offered by the school system of Palo Alto, Calif. This is a comparatively sophisticated, high-income community, in which Stanford University faculty members and electronics engineers predominate.

To introduce sex education in the Palo Alto kindergartens, teachers occasionally borrow babies from their mothers and bathe them in class. One small boy, who knew the right word but was seeing a naked male infant for the first time, shouted in a sunburst of happy comprehension, "Look, look, another penis!"

Recently, a visitor to Palo Alto watched an 11-year-old girl unselfconsciously drawing on a blackboard a detailed sectional view of the male sex organs. On the wall of a senior classroom hung a montage, the homework assigned to a 17-year-old student, composed of the main contraceptive devices, each with a neatly typed card beneath, explaining how it worked. A boy the same age read the class a paper he had written which summarized the psychological, legal and moral aspects of homosexuality. Questions to the teacher were sometimes couched in the language of the streets, for which the teacher, when respond-

ing, would casually substitute the polite terms.

Boys and girls study together, and much of the instruction comes in the form of general discussion such as the following, in which a senior class took up one of the great sexual dilemmas of youth. As the teacher, Robert Shreve, framed it, "The male's sex drive at sixteen or seventeen is much stronger than the female's. She wants to have her hand held, not necessarily to go to bed. Is this a valid observation?"

"I'm not so sure," said a boy. "Plenty of girls enjoy sex. It depends on the individual."

Another boy: "If I like a girl, holding hands isn't enough."

"But if you like her," said a third boy, "you don't want to hurt her, do you?"

Shreve put in, "When a boy and girl are unaware of their psychological differences, it can make serious trouble for them, can't it?"

"Yes. He might go after her just for sex."

It is when questions about birth control arise that many schools suffer their worst lapses from honesty. They do not tell the whole truth. Chicago, for example, is a city where petty crooks, counting on the ignorance of youngsters, hang around high schools, peddling contraceptive pills at a dollar each, with the promise that one swallowed before intercourse guarantees protection. Yet the new Chicago sex-education program excludes the subject of contraception altogether. "Ask your minister or family doctor," is the customary formula. At Evanston's Nichols Junior High, the former director of physical education, Ronald Thompson, says he never ducked the subject of birth-control pills. "The main thing I did," he admits, "was to stress their unreliability." Gynecologists insist, however, that the Pill, when correctly used, has proved to be just about 100 percent effective.

A good many independent, or private, schools also accept sex education as their proper concern; indeed, some of the more progressive private schools were quietly taking it up long before the present frenzy swept the nation. North Shore Country Day in Winnetka, Ill., for example, originated a program 32 years ago, which it recently broadened in scope because, as Headmaster Nathaniel S. French explains, "It seemed to us that the experience of our students in college must reflect their secondary-school experience; the stories of male-female relationships in the most prestigious institutions disturbed us. Then we found that in our own community there were similar tales to be told. Lastly, we began to discover relationships between boys and girls in our own school which demanded that the problem be reviewed. Sadly, we had to admit that some individuals had suffered hurt which might have been prevented."

Because, in the main, they have small, relatively homogeneous enrollments and freedom from official constraints, and can offer the kind of salaries and working conditions that attract superior teachers, private schools can do things in sex education that are impossible in the overcrowded, understaffed, community-controlled public schools. On the whole, private-school programs are so low-keyed and gradual that they scarcely qualify as programs at all, in the strict sense. They are inclined to avoid using the sort of minutely structured, one-two-three teaching manuals put together by the planners, and they set aside no special classroom period when teacher tells Johnny, in effect, "Now we're going to talk about sex." They prefer to treat the subject as it may arise naturally within the context of other courses. For example, Mrs. Allan J. Sanker, who heads the English department at Cincinnati's Hillsdale School, notes that *The Scarlet Letter* affords an opportunity "to give consideration to adultery in the novel, in various times of history, and in the present day."

Some of the private-school teachers come up with highly individualistic, often impromptu techniques. When a young married teacher at Shady Hill, a Cambridge, Mass., day school (400 boys and girls, ages 4 to 14), reached the visible stage of pregnancy—to the fascination of her five-year-old pupils—she began to use her own unfolding experience to explain human reproduction to them in very personal terms.

The countrywide clamor for sex education has not completely drowned out the protests of a dissenting minority; their vehemence compensates for their numerical weakness. One group of dissenters is composed of the sort of die-hard conservatives who oppose any liberalizing trend. They variously protest that sex education consumes taxpayers' dollars that would be better spent improving conventional teaching facilities; that it encroaches on areas where the state should never tread; that it misleads immature minds. A second group is made up of educators and psychologists who, while not opposing sex education in principle, object to the methods employed.

The Anaheim program, for example, is under constant attack from local conservatives. In this community, where 92 percent of the parents are said to stand solidly behind Superintendent Cook's Family Life program, the arch-conservative local newspaper, the *Bulletin*, keeps up a relentless drumfire of criticism. According to its editor, Sam Campbell, the premise "that sex information is the pathway to morality . . . if pursued to its rational extremity, would elevate Sodom to the Puritan capital of the universe and substitute Paris for Jerusalem as the Holy City."

Ironically, in California, where public-school sex education has moved farther and faster than in any other state, one of the most caustic critics is the state's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Max Rafferty. A syndicated columnist on the side (and now a candidate for the U.S. Senate), Rafferty headed a recent column, *Who Needs More Sex Education?* "How can the schools unilaterally solve a problem which originates outside the schools and which permeates society as a whole?" he wrote. "And the answer is: They cannot. Only when we adults . . . set a decent example and demand decent behavior from the young will children start growing up to become the kind of people we want them to be, and should have been ourselves."

Some of the sharpest criticism comes from psychologists and psychoanalysts. Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand, a noted New York child analyst, author of *Love, Sex and the Teenager*, deplores organized, insistent sex education for the very young. "How far is this folly going to go?" she demands. "They're repeating the same mistake the Freudians made years ago. The rationale then was that since repressions may cause neuroses, get rid of all repressions. So parents made a point of calling their children's attention to sexual matters, and they condoned primitive sexual behavior. Yet children so reared often developed severe anxieties. When psychoanalyzed, they revealed the damage this system caused. We know now that the sublimation of sexual curiosity and behavior is necessary if children are to acquire intellectual training. Otherwise they might play sex games all day long. Sublimation, in fact, is the price, we must pay to live in a civilized society. Cramming sex knowledge down kids' throats does not promote healthy growth. The likely effect is more anxiety, not less."

A child's spontaneous questions about sex, Dr. Lorand agrees, should receive straightforward, honest answers, but neither teachers nor parents should anticipate curiosity. A cardinal Victorian blunder was scaring children, telling them they were evil little monsters for inquiring into such dirty things. Many sex-education programs, in Dr.

Lorand's view, commit the opposite excess by force-feeding children this once-forbidden knowledge.

She further challenges the propriety of throwing teen-age boys and girls together in sex-education classes, asking, "Why not let girlish shyness develop into womanly modesty?" Not long ago a sex-education zealot arguing that co-ed classes made for naturalness between the sexes, spoke approvingly of a 15-year-old boy who remarked to the girl beside him, "You look depressed today. Are you menstruating? Are you having cramps?" "Now wasn't that nice?" commented the enthusiast. "Didn't that show understanding?" "Nice?" retorted Dr. Lorand. "I think it was an atrocious invasion of privacy."

She also found appalling the slides used in a Westchester County elementary school, which show dogs copulating, followed by a human couple under bed sheets, as a recorded voice explains, "Mummy and Daddy are doing the same thing the dogs do."

As Dr. Lorand and a lot of her colleagues see it, such explicit public displays inflict harm by creating an emotional split—by arousing sexual excitement, while requiring its immediate suppression.

Intense sexual curiosity begins at about the age of three, psychologists say; children start to explore their own bodies and also try to discover how other people are made. They want to watch each other being undressed and bathed—a natural healthy urge, the psychiatrists say. Let them touch themselves; let them watch. It does not follow, however, that they should be allowed to see adults in the nude, because this overstimulates their sexual curiosity. When a child attempts to do so, the parents should declare their preference for privacy, but at the same time offer to explain whatever the child wishes to know. Around the fifth year, sexual curiosity, if not overstimulated, will normally shift to other areas, and the child can then proceed to academic learning. For children around 10—no younger—the school can usefully provide a limited amount of uncomplicated, direct teaching in preparation for puberty. During the teens advanced sex education can be valuable.

"If parents can't talk about sex comfortably to their children," Dr. Lorand concludes, "even embarrassed silence may be less injurious than exposing them to an ill-conceived school program. The trouble with parents today is that they're so petrified of doing the wrong thing they tend to retreat from involvement with their children."

Among the experts who concur, in general, is Dr. E. James Lieberman, a psychiatrist at the National Institute of Mental Health. "Don't overwhelm the child," says Dr. Lieberman, chief of the Institute's Center for Studies of Child and Family Mental Health. "Even perfectly accurate information can . . . be disturbing . . . if the child is not ready intellectually or emotionally."

If the present frantic scurry to set up new programs subsides without falling back into apathy, a calm, sane, generally applicable model program may well emerge. But formidable obstacles intervene. One of these is the shortage of teachers. There are scarcely enough teachers available to handle the ordinary "safe" subjects, let alone to cope with one that requires the sensitivity and balance needed for sex education.

A more formidable obstacle is the rampant controversy over the meaning and purpose of sex education. The schools are still unsure about what moral values, if any, they should try to instill, with the result that they tend to put off children with evasions, half-truths and downright falsehoods. In this uncertainty lies the basic problem: What do we really consider is the purpose of sex education? What do we really want our children to be taught? The straight facts? Well, yes. But above all we want them to avoid premarital sexual relations, don't

we? And isn't classroom frankness apt to overstimulate them, tempt them to experiment? So we expect the teacher to mingle fact with propaganda, maybe throw an occasional scare into the kids by stressing the traditional dangers of sexual misconduct—i.e., infection, conception and detection.

A beleaguered West Coast high school principal summed up the resulting dilemma: "You can't sustain any kind of sex-education program without the community's support—which is to say, the parents' support. Unhappily, what we hope to accomplish as educators, and what the parents demand as parents, are often miles apart. We're really in a bind."

A FINANCIAL EMERGENCY

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the reading of my colleagues a New York Times story and editorial on the tax measure approved by the Congress last week on June 21.

The tax increase was long delayed in coming—and I think it is fair to say that this is an instance in which the Congress was not as flexible as we should have been. The increase was needed 2 years ago. The medicine would not have been so bitter then as it is now.

Tax increases are never popular, but at times necessary; and it was this necessity which prevailed despite some clouded hopes that somehow things would get better without an increase.

The New York Times editorial which follows lends a fair perspective to the 2-year struggle and a few hopes for the near future. The article, succeeding the editorial is by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., and speaks of the financial emergency which finally required the vote.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1968]

A FINANCIAL EMERGENCY: HOUSE TAKES THE UNPOPULAR TAX PATH BECAUSE NATIONAL INTEREST IS INVOLVED

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—A financial emergency is difficult to feel, see or even understand, especially when it is as much potential as actual. But a sense of impending financial emergency, to go with the rest of the nation's troubles, was the reason why a majority in the House voted today to raise the people's taxes.

It is about the most unpopular vote that a Congressman can cast. Every one in the House is up for re-election this year, and the tax bill, with its associated expenditure reduction, has become entangled emotionally with the war in Vietnam, aid to the poor and other deep-seated issues.

Pundits had argued for months that the closer to election the vote came, the more likely the tax increase was to be defeated.

But it passed, for a reason familiar to longtime observers of Congress: When the national interest or safety is fairly clearly at stake, a majority in Congress is willing to take the unpopular path.

An example often cited is the Marshall plan in 1948. Foreign aid was unfamiliar and had little popular support. But Congress accepted the view that the economic recovery of Europe was imperative in order to prevent chaos and a probable Communist takeover, which would have threatened the whole of postwar foreign policy.

SIGNAL OF EMERGENCY

To some members, the signal of the current emergency was the gold crisis of last March. To some it was the rise of interest rates to levels not seen in a century.

To others it was the evidence—as distinct from the prediction—that prices were rising far more rapidly than in earlier years of the decade.

To almost all there was the "big number"—a budget deficit of more than \$20-billion.

To busy and politically preoccupied men these matters were not always of immediate attention and concern. Not many members of Congress know yesterday's London gold price or read the daily bond market column. The process by which the sense of emergency arose in them included a great deal of persuasion by the Johnson Administration and others.

The persuasion in good part, amounted to a process of calling attention to the facts—obscure ones such as interest rates and bond prices.

"In the end," said one House member recently, "most of us became persuaded that the one thing this country has going for it—our prosperity—was in jeopardy. No one could prove it, but the case was pretty impressive."

The process involved a great deal of bargaining, particularly over the degree of expenditure reduction that would accompany the tax increase. The bargaining took so long that some financial men are afraid the tax bill may have come too late. But the compromise it produced is classic.

The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers fought hard for a larger expenditure reduction than the \$6-billion achieved. In the end they were sending telegrams to the members urging support of the bill.

President Johnson fought hard for no expenditure reduction at all. In the end he publicly accepted the final version and sent his indefatigable Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, on an umpteenth round of personal visits to the members to describe, yet again, the dangers of failure to raise taxes.

The President, unannounced, called groups of Democrats to the White House to make the case, usually in the evening and usually with his chief budget and economic advisers present. At one crucial session, in late April, he bargained with the five key Democrats concerned about the spending issue.

There was clearly no great popular outcry for the bill, as in the current case of gun controls, though there was much letter-writing by business and financial groups and advocacy in speeches and otherwise by community leaders. One way or another, a majority of members became persuaded by somewhat sophisticated argument more than by emotion or by "arm-twisting."

A few comments, made in recent weeks in circumstances that were not designed for direct attribution, are revealing:

A member from North Carolina: "I began to smell that the nation was in trouble financially last fall, but I knew that we in Congress wouldn't do a damn thing then. I felt all along we'd have to do it, though."

DEPRESSION FEARED

An urban member from Pennsylvania: "My poor people don't like it because of the spending cuts, and the same goes for some of the unions and so on. But I have become persuaded that without it we could have a major depression, and then where would they be?"

A member from Oklahoma: "We're in a mess. There are some parts of the bill I don't like at all, but I can't see the dollar go down the drain."

A member from Indiana: "I could even lose the election on this issue. But what the hell am I elected for, in the last analysis, if I don't do what is right?"

In a complex and cynical world, the explanation of today's vote is as simple as that. A majority of members thought it was right.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1968]

FISCAL HURDLE

With yesterday's affirmative vote in the House, the bill combining the 10 per cent tax surcharge and the \$6-billion reduction in Federal spending has surmounted the most serious hurdle in the long and tortuous obstacle course that has bedeviled and delayed it. At long last, flexible fiscal policy will have a chance to work.

Unfortunately, this vital experiment in economic flexibility is coming at least two years to late. The Administration was remiss in failing to demand a tax increase in 1966, when positive action could have contained inflationary pressure and strengthened the international position of the dollar. And Congress was equally at fault in not pressing for spending cuts before the budget had soared out of control.

Nevertheless, the compromise program finally accepted by the House is still vitally needed if only for its symbolic significance. The resort to unpopular but responsible fiscal action cannot repair the damage already done to the domestic economy or to the stability of the dollar, but it does demonstrate that Congress is anxious to prevent further deterioration.

A much more modest dose of restraint would have sufficed if action had been taken earlier. Now, the combined package may be effective only in halting the upward climb of interest rates and stemming the soaring outflow of dollars.

The threat that it might also result in a cutback in Federal outlays for needed social services has been allayed by Representative Wilbur Mill's pledge that there will be no reductions in spending for welfare and urban programs. The hope must now be that Congress will make sensible and overdue reductions in other civilian and non-Vietnam defense projects and thus permit increased resources to combat poverty and urban decay.

One danger in the House's belated action is that fiscal restraint will reinforce the slowing down of the economic advance after the unsustainable pace of the last six months. That could mean fewer jobs and a shrinking of opportunities for those seeking work. But a faltering of the economy can be reversed by stimulatory fiscal action. What could not be risked was the speed-up of the inflationary spiral and aggravation of the payments deficits that seemed in prospect if the House had continued to dawdle.

Once spending is under control and taxes increase, it will be easier to work out a thoroughgoing program of expenditure and tax reform. This will be the task of the next Administration and Congress. But it cannot be accomplished until the present bill wins final passage and becomes the law of the land.

TOMORROW'S TRANSPORTATION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, President Johnson sent Congress a report titled "Tomorrow's Transportation: New Systems for the Urban Future," the result of an 18-month study by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It was authorized by an amendment to the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966. During this period, I have worked closely with Charles M. Haahr,

Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, who directed the study. In my judgment, this report is an outstanding achievement in carrying out the mandate of Congress. It represents the first major specific effort to formulate a comprehensive urban transportation research and demonstration program to help ease the problems of all Americans who live in, or commute to work to, our cities.

For the information of my colleagues, I include the President's statement, the statement of Secretary Robert C. Weaver, and an editorial endorsing the study from the June 16, 1968, edition of the Washington Post:

President Johnson today sent to Congress a summary report of a major study which recommends a program of transportation research and development to ease the problems of Americans who live in or commute to work in cities.

Developed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development it is the first major Federal effort to formulate a comprehensive urban transportation research, development and demonstration program.

As a part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the President requested a research and development program for urban mass transportation of \$25 million to maintain the momentum of this study. In addition, he requested increased funds for the Urban Mass Transportation Program at a level of \$230 million for Fiscal 1970 to help local governments implement many of these ideas.

The Senate has approved these requests, and the Bill is now under consideration in the House of Representatives.

New systems for meeting urban travel needs ranging from those of the pedestrian to those of the air traveler and improvements in existing service and facilities, new and improved system components, and new and improved methods of planning and operating urban transportation systems are reviewed.

For the future, the new systems study found many promising technologies which should be further explored, such as automatic controls for vehicles and entire movement systems; new kinds of propulsion, energy and power transmission; new guideway and suspension components; innovations in tunneling; and the application of these potentials for movement of goods as well as people.

The promising new systems discussed in the summary report are:

Dial-a-Bus: A bus type of system activated on demand of the potential passengers, perhaps by telephone, after which a computer logs the calls, origins, destinations, location of vehicles and number of passengers, and then selects the vehicle and dispatches it.

Personnel Rapid Transit: Small vehicles, traveling over exclusive rights-of-way, automatically routed from origin to destination over a network guideway system, primarily to serve low- to medium-population density areas of metropolises.

Dual Mode Vehicle Systems: Small vehicles which can be individually driven and converted from street travel to travel on automatic guideway networks.

Automated Dual Mode Bus: A large vehicle system which would combine the high-speed capacity of a rail system operating on its private right-of-way with the flexibility and adaptability of a city bus.

Pallet or Ferry Systems: An alternative to dual mode vehicle systems is the use of pallets to carry (or ferry) conventional automobiles, minibuses, or freight automatically on high-speed guideways.

Fast Intraurban Transit Links: Automatically controlled vehicle capable of operating either independently or coupling into trains, serving metropolitan area travel needs between major urban nodes.

New Systems for Major Activity Centers: Continuously moving belts; capsule transit systems, some on guideways, perhaps suspended above city streets.

Other proposals of more general application were considered to improve fare collection methods, security of passengers and operators, methods for communicating station and passenger information, and, of particular significance, management and operation of urban transit systems.

In transmitting the summary report, entitled *Tomorrow's Transportation: New Systems for the Urban Future*, to the Congress, President Johnson commended it for study "by the Congress and the concerned Federal, State and local agencies."

"It provides a good foundation for decisions upon the program of research and development required to develop the needed new systems of transportation for our crowded metropolitan areas," the President said.

WEAVER LAUDS STUDY AS MAJOR EFFORT TO IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION TECHNOLOGY

Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development today lauded the recommendations released by President Johnson calling for a comprehensive program of research and development in all aspects of urban transportation.

The Secretary said the recommendations, contained in a far-reaching report for improved urban transportation entitled *"Tomorrow's Transportation: New Systems for the Urban Future,"* reflects "the concern of the Administration for cities and their people, as well as for their transportation."

The research and development program outlined in the report would cost several hundred million dollars over the next few years. It was developed by HUD during an 18-month "new systems study" of urban transportation as directed by the Urban Mass Transportation Amendments of 1966.

"Throughout," Secretary Weaver said, "our concern has been to relate technology and scientific innovation as closely as possible to the present and desired shape of our cities and the improved quality of life of urban residents."

"The role of the recommended program is stressed as only one of a number of tools needed to bring better cities into existence in the future through an orderly process of ameliorating the urban difficulties of the present. While urban transportation research, development and demonstration alone cannot solve our current urban problems or bring about our desired future cities, it is an indispensable instrument for our efforts to reach these goals."

He added: "This summary report should be viewed as the first major effort to formulate a comprehensive urban transportation research, development and demonstration program. The program, its focus and objectives, will evolve as it is carried out."

"This evolution must be consonant with research, development, demonstration and implementation programs in all aspects of urban service, facilities and development. It is our hope that we have been as successful in our effort as the Congress was far-sighted in requesting that this effort be undertaken."

In brief, the study found that progress in urban transportation technology, could be greatly enhanced and accelerated by vigorous leadership of the Federal Government—in cooperation with the private industries concerned—using a systematic, carefully designed, and reasonably funded research and development program as the major guiding stimulus.

The capacity and the capabilities of American industry and private enterprise stand ready. The scientific and technical manpower needed for increased research and analysis in the field of urban transportation is available. But a stimulus is needed to progress, to prevent future neglect of intra-urban transportation technology and systems, and to develop means by which this progress can contribute to the quality of urban life.

A part of "Tomorrow's Transportation" examines the promise of existing technologies to improve present urban transportation systems. It identifies some exciting short-run improvements that could be undertaken.

But beyond immediate improvements, Secretary Weaver noted, this report projects a continuing research and development effort which could turn innovation into application, and accelerate transit technology in a careful and deliberate, rather than accidental way.

The effort would involve these areas: Improved analysis, planning, and operating methods; immediate system improvements; components for future systems; and the development of entirely new systems for the future.

Major objectives of the New Systems Study are:

To achieve equality of access to urban educational, job, and cultural opportunities; to improve the quality of transit services;

To relieve traffic congestion; to enhance efficiency in the use of equipment and facilities;

To achieve more efficient urban land use; to provide cleaner, quieter, and more attractive public transportation;

To provide more alternatives to urban residents in mode and style of urban living;

And to permit orderly improvements of urgent transportation problems without preempting long-range solutions for the future.

[From the Washington Post, June 16, 1968]

THE FUTURE OF URBAN TRANSIT

Considering the state of urban transportation in the country, the proposals made to Congress by the Department of Housing and Urban Development are modest. It has recommended that the Federal Government spend about a billion dollars over five years in a program of research and development aimed at finding and demonstrating better ways of moving people in and around cities. Although there is little hope for much of a beginning on such a program in a year of economy, Congress ought to begin a serious study of this recommendation. In light of the billions of Federal dollars poured into intercity highways and the billions spent each year on military research and development, HUD's request is remarkably small.

The problem, of course, is fantastically large. It is now estimated that about 150 million Americans live in urban areas, almost twice as many as lived in such areas in 1940. Yet, the number of passengers carried by urban public transit (excluding commuter railroads) fell 36 per cent between 1940 and 1966. The resulting congestion of highways, growth of parking facilities, rising level of air pollution, and increased strain of the human nervous system are known to anyone who comes in contact with a city.

The HUD report says that \$50 billion, most of it state and local funds, will be spent on urban freeways and mass transit systems in the next ten years. Since this will be spent on a city-by-city basis, it is unlikely that there will be any major breakthroughs in methods of moving people because a single city cannot take a chance on an unproved system. The role the Federal Government ought to play, as HUD recommends, is to develop a range of new systems which will give cities a choice of new and better methods

instead of merely refinements on existing ideas about buses, subways and trains.

Among the systems HUD would like to try to develop is one that would have small vehicles moved along high-speed networks; the passengers would enter the car, push the button for the station he wished to reach, and sit back until his car reached that station where it would be automatically switched off the main track. A variant of this would allow the commuter to drive the vehicle home and bring it back the following morning. Another system would allow persons in low-density areas to summon a bus to their door by telephone. A third would consist of pallets onto which an automobile could be driven and then speeded automatically down a track to its destination. There are several others.

Some of the ideas may sound far-fetched but HUD insists they appear to be technically and economically feasible. What it wants is funds to prove that they are. Since the alternative to new and better ways of transportation inside urban areas is strangulation and suffocation of those areas by automobiles, it is about time a serious search for those ways began.

JOHN ECONOMY

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an article from the Savannah Morning News concerning the passing of one of the dearest persons who ever lived on this earth—a man who not only realized the American dream but instilled it in others. He not only enjoyed the American way of life—he defended it. His affection for his adopted country transcended all things. He demanded and exercised love of law and devotion to its precepts. There was no greater American. There was no better friend. The article follows:

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, June 22, 1968]

BEAUFORT HAS LOST A BELOVED CITIZEN

(By Jim Littlejohn)

BEAUFORT, S.C.—Mr. John left us this week—and we all feel just a little poorer because of it.

I am speaking, of course, of John Paul Economy, restaurateur, civic leader and friend of both the mighty and the not-so-mighty.

An immigrant to this country after he was grown, Mr. John was the embodiment of the American dream of the first half of this century. He came from the oppression and poverty of his native Greece and made not only a financial success in America, but became a part of it in all of its facets.

Actually, though we mourn his passing, Mr. John lives on among us. Physically in the presence of his family and spiritually as part of the community he helped to build.

Stories will be told for years to come about his "Sea View" restaurant on Bay Street that I was never fortunate enough to visit. Humorous stories about Mr. John and his friends are already a part of Beaufort legend—and although some say he had little sense of humor, I think, perhaps that is the way he would like to be remembered. Arguing with his good friend Ed McTeer, strolling and discussing politics with Mendel Rivers, preparing his special "gravy" and generally enjoying life in the pleasant location of Beaufort.

One story that is told about Mr. John may be apocryphal, but it seems to tell much about his sense of humor that some say he did not possess. He reportedly told it on himself on several occasions.

The time was during the late 1930s and Mr. John had gone down to the restaurant, as was his custom, early in the morning to start the coffee.

A burly truckdriver came and knocked on the door and Mr. John let him in, although it was before opening hours. The driver demanded breakfast in a rough tone of voice and Mr. John eyed the pistol on his belt and decided not to argue.

He fixed the ham and eggs, hotcakes and mountains of toast requested by the man and then went on with his other duties. The man then began lowrating another restaurant owner up the road who had charged him the outrageous sum of 30 cents for breakfast the day before. "You know," the fellow said, "I ought to go back up there and shoot him for being such a blankety-blank crook." The man then stood up and came to the cash register to pay his bill. "How much do I owe you?" he asked. "Would 15 cents be too much?" Mr. John asked back.

In 1952 Mr. John and a few of his friends founded "The Economy Club" in Beaufort and drew its name, according to Frank Ramsey, from its creed, which was "economy in government." Chances are that Mr. John's adopted last name had much to do with that creed, however. At any rate, the club prospered and flowered, and although it barred "politicians and lawyers" from its membership, it became an effective force in the social and political life of the community, and relaxed its rules occasionally to take in such non-politicians as Mr. John's life-long friend Rep. L. Mendel Rivers.

Rivers' friendship for Mr. John was well-known and it was no surprise that the busy Congressman shelved all other business this week in order to attend Mr. John's funeral as the chief honorary pallbearer.

The nation of Greece has been generous in its gifts to the world—gifts of ideas and of men—and although we are saddened by his loss, we are proud that Greece gave us the life of John Economy—and that he chose to spend a large part of it in Beaufort.

H.R. 10480—REGARDING PENALTIES FOR THE DEFILEMENT AND DESACRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1968

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to laud the action of the Senate in unanimously passing H.R. 10480, which outlaws defilement and desecration of the flag of the United States. Let this clear display of unanimity demonstrate the belief, commonly held by this Nation's loyal citizens, that disgrace of the flag is an insult to the American Nation, and to all the ideals this great democracy cherishes. Let this show that the impression that may have been given abroad represents but a minute minority of American opinion.

As a longtime advocate of this legislation and as a sponsor of the House bill, I welcome the action by the Senate with special gratification, and trust the Members of this House will now give a re-

sounding endorsement of the Senate action by overwhelmingly approving the Senate's slightly amended version of the bill.

This long-overdue legislation plugs a glaring omission in the Federal law which has never made it a crime to defile, desecrate, or burn the American flag.

It is repugnant to me that the attitude of permissiveness that has permeated certain segments of our society allows some of these acts committed against the flag to be condoned under the guise of dissent. I do not classify burning the flag as dissent. I do not call defiling the flag an expression of freedom. I call many of the acts we are witnessing outright treason, and we have been "mollycoddling" the perpetrators of these incidents too long.

I am sure that you felt as disgusted as I did—that your stomachs turned as mine did—at the sight of those so-called demonstrators last year who defiantly burned the American flag in Central Park before a television audience of countless millions. Similar acts of desecration have become familiar sights these past 2 years—and, yet, what is being done about it?

Believe it or not, we have had no Federal laws in this country making such acts of defiling the flag a crime. Oh, to be sure, there are State laws, but most of these are weak, difficult to enforce, and, more often than not, offenders, if they receive any punishment at all, get off with a token fine. Some States have meaningless laws, like Indiana, which has a maximum penalty of a \$5 fine. Can you imagine that? Defiling, degrading, desecrating the symbol of our Nation, and one can get away with it altogether, or may get by with a \$5 fine.

This is dead wrong. I say such offenses should be violations of Federal law—the flag is our national emblem representing the national unity of our 50 States, and its desecration should be a national crime and the penalties should be stiff—at least a fine of \$1,000 and a year in prison.

For years I have sponsored bills along these lines and early in 1967, I joined with an able and distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. ROUBEUSH] in sponsoring the legislation which passed the House on June 20, 1967, 1 year to the day before it was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The bill has now passed the Senate with two minor amendments, which I wholeheartedly endorse. The purpose of one amendment, by inserting the word "knowingly," is to make clear that knowledge and intent must be present to constitute a criminal act; and the second amendment, which inserts the word "burning," is to make clear the bill proscribes public burning of the flag along with other contemptuous acts of destruction.

I feel certain that when we approve this flag bill, the provisions of this legislation will provide standards for a number of States to amend their own statutes to make the penalty for desecrating the flag more nearly fit the crime.

Thus, a twofold purpose will be served when this bill is passed. A strong, effective legal machinery for Federal prosecution of desecrators of our flag will be established, with tough penalties and en-

forcement provisions, and, at the same time, a model code will be available for the States to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that we will approve this bill, which places the Federal Government in the primary position it should hold, as the defender of our national emblem, and provides effective enforcement features and meaningful punishment for willful violators.

CONGRESSMAN BOB ECKHARDT

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, those of us from Texas who have had the great privilege of serving in the State legislature of our State are well aware of the record of achievement of one of our illustrious colleagues, Representative BOB ECKHARDT, of Houston, Tex. He is widely known as a brilliant forensic and legislative leader. Many landmark pieces of legislation in Texas bear his imprint.

In Congress, Representative ECKHARDT is equally well known and respected and admired for his great talents. He has sponsored or supported the most beneficial and progressive programs the 90th Congress has entertained and passed.

He has been a source of inspiration to us all. On one complex and difficult area of discussion he has been most active in enlightening some of us and offering his leadership. One of these is the difficult and nettlesome question of trade restrictions, both proposed as well as existing. Representative ECKHARDT has done a monumental job in acquainting and familiarizing some of us with the intricacies of this issue. He has brilliantly and clearly shown us the bad and detrimental aspects of some pending proposals, which hold some degree of attractiveness because they are based on the natural desire to protect what is "American."

Recently the great daily newspaper in Houston, Tex., the Houston Chronicle, published an informative editorial in which Congressman ECKHARDT's contributions were noted. Also, Congressman ECKHARDT presented a lucid and important bit of testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial and the testimony for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, June 22, 1968]

HOUSTON TAKE IN TRADE

Foreign trade has to be a two-way street. We buy from other nations, and we sell to other nations. We buy what other trading nations offer at attractive prices. And we sell the products we offer which foreign consumers want to own.

If we didn't import goods, we wouldn't be able to export for long except at an economic loss to our own nation.

When a domestic manufacturer calls for protection from a foreign competitor, every American should realize that we all benefit from world trade. A protected market becomes a noncompetitive market, at least to the extent it is protected.

Here in Houston, where we maintain the

nation's third largest port, we have more than passing interest in encouraging world trade. Rep. Bob Eckhardt pointed out the other day that the trade barriers on imports which are currently being studied by the House Ways and Means Committee, if enacted, could knock more than 20 percent of the employees in port operation out of their jobs.

And he correctly points out that it is the average consumer who stands to lose the most if the protectionists have their way. Imports reduce the supply of goods on the market and curtail competition. And the absence of competition means higher consumer prices.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB ECKHARDT BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, JUNE 17, 1968

I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to present my views on tariff and trade proposals. I will try to be brief and concise. There are three points I would like to make:

(1) The most beneficial international economic policy for the United States is essentially one of free trade;

(2) As a representative from the Houston Port area, I feel that my constituents would have much to lose if a wall of protectionism arose around our country; and

(3) I support the President in his call for the elimination of the American Selling Price system.

There has been increasing discussion and support in the halls of Congress for general and specific increases in quota restrictions on foreign imports. There are two reasons given to justify stiffer trade barriers: first, that such is a broad economic prescription to cure our balance of payments difficulties; and, second, that we should give relief to specific industries under pressure from rising imports. I wish to challenge both of these arguments; they are fallacious. Protective measures will do more to aggravate the situation than to help it.

One must keep in mind, in a discussion like this, the distinction between the balance of payments and the balance of trade. The balance of payments is made up, basically, of two separate categories; the balance of trade, which is the actual flow of goods and services, and the capital account, which includes the flow of investments and government transactions—loans, foreign aid, military expenditures, and so forth. Until very recently, the balance of trade has always been well in our favor. The drastic reduction in our trade surplus is primarily due to the excessive aggregate demand of our economy. There has been an almost incredible rise in imports due to this inflation. If Congress passes the fiscal restraint measures presently pending, the flow of imports should return to normal.

The protectionist does not see it this way. He reasons that by cutting down on foreign imports, our balance of trade surplus will increase and this in turn will reduce the balance of payments deficit. Rather than pursuing a course of trade expansion and liberalization, he seeks a curtailment. Rather than expanding the flow of goods, services and international goodwill, he seeks the easy way out.

The basic flaw in the protectionist's reasoning is this: While imports to this Nation will be reduced by the stiffer quotas, American exports will similarly decline. There is no doubt that other nations, whose economies would suffer due to the reduction of the American market for their goods, would retaliate.

Now we must consider for a moment our trade posture now as compared to that in a more normal economic environment. Over the last several years—before we unduly procrastinated in levying a tax to stave off inflation—we had a trade surplus that ran

around \$4.5 billion, more or less, over a number of years.

Now, because of the abnormally inflated prices of American goods subject to foreign trade, our trading partners are doing no more than swapping even. They can afford to buy only about the same value of goods as they sell. Now suppose we enact trade restrictions against their products at a time when our products are most dear. It is quite reasonable, if not absolutely necessary on their part, to quit buying expensive American goods and start making it themselves. Thus, our exports, already diminished, reduce to an absolute minimum.

Then, when we enact the necessary fiscal restraints to restore the value of the dollar, we find ourselves in a world market in which the economies of other nations have been geared to be more self-sustaining. Obviously, we have much more to lose than our trading partners do because, normally, we export goods valued at about \$4½ billion more than the value of the goods we import.

Thus, if our trading partners retaliate by a percentage cut in their normal level of imports equal to our percentage cut in our imports, we come out the big loser. Therefore, there is no question but that, in the long run, restrictive import quotas would hurt, not help, our international accounts difficulties.

Now, why did we become the most advantageously situated trading nation during most of this decade? By being in the forefront of the march toward liberalizing international trade. We inspired the most-favored-nation clause of the early tariff reductions of the 1930's; we were the inspiration behind GATT; it was an American president for whom the most recent round of tariff reductions was named; all postwar and recent international economic cooperation arises from American idealism. Thus, the mere talk of protectionism turns those who, through our quest for liberal free trade, became dependent upon our markets into cynics instead of good customers. Protectionism is a repudiation of all our free trade ideals.

Furthermore, quotas are nearly always arbitrary and discriminatory. Under either a base period or first come-first served basis, some nations are singled out to come under stricter quotas. Those penalized will take this action as an indication of the arbitrariness of the American foreign policy.

Also, free trade is a hedge against inflation. The segment of our society which has the most to lose if the protectionists have their way is the average consumer. Were import quotas made more restrictive, and hence conditions made less competitive for American businessmen, there would be less pressure on prices. Less competition and a reduced supply of goods are concomitants of high prices. Competition from abroad forces American industry to innovate more and to become more efficient. Foreign trade broadens the spectrum and variety of goods available, lowers prices and stretches the wage earner's pay. It can be seen, then, that the primary benefactor of free trade is the American consumer, which is to say, the American people at large. Whatever short run gains a particular interest group might gain from a protectionist policy is thus at the expense of the American people.

What about the effects on the business sector? The protectionist emphasizes only the negative effects of international trade. Certainly one cannot dispute that some businesses and their workers are subject to disruption as a consequence of competition from abroad. But, because of vast superiority in technology, education, productivity and geographic advantages, when we choose to produce that which we can produce cheapest and best, we are not very much limited. If, through advancing technology and greater efficiency, domestic producers still cannot

meet the foreign prices, perhaps we must admit to ourselves that there are certain areas in which other nations are better qualified. We can sell the goods which a more sophisticated technology can produce cheapest and buy certain cheap consumer goods, component parts, and ingredients for manufacture from other countries with less sophisticated economies and be the net gainer.

Free trade, it can be seen, has a two-sided effect on the business sector and employment. The government does have an obligation to those establishments and employees for whom trade has a detrimental effect. I applaud the President for his recommendations on adjustment assistance to firms and workers. We must not overlook the fact, however, that trade can stimulate an otherwise lethargic firm or industry to action that might expand production and employment.

The absence of restraints on trade has possibly a greater effect on the positive side. A movement towards more liberalism will benefit all those industries and firms that have foreign markets. According to a recent government report, employment in the United States related to exports of goods increased by nearly 4 percent, or by 91,000, between 1960 and 1965. In 1965, an estimated 2.4 million jobs were attributable to exports of merchandise and another half million to exports of service. (*Monthly Labor Review*, December 1967). This does not include all of the indirect, supporting employment. If we follow a course of protectionism, which would undoubtedly be followed by retaliation abroad, what would happen to these people? I believe we have more to gain by promoting trade expansion and depending on American competitiveness to bring about a huge net gain in terms of profits and employment. I offer as a suggestion to the distinguished members of the committee the possibility of some formal, semi-formal or even moral arrangement whereby those industries greatly benefiting by the expansion of international trade would be obligated to rely for all additional employment on the rolls of those workers adversely affected by same. For instance, a foundry worker laid off by a steel company would be a prime candidate for employment by a machinery firm enjoying an expanding export business.

I conclude this section by saying that legislation to reverse the course we have taken toward free trade is bad economics, bad foreign policy, and is bad for the people. I suggest to the committee that, when its ramifications are understood, it is bad politics.

Now, let me turn for a moment to application of these principles to my own district. If we look solely to the Houston area, the case is overwhelmingly against restriction of imports. For the year 1967 about \$59 billion worth of imports were imported through Houston as opposed to \$1.36 billion exported through the port. It is easily seen that the people in my district have far more to lose in terms of profits and employment from trade restrictions than could possibly be gained. Import quotas would have a disastrous effect on the many longshoremen, seamen, masters, mates, and pilots who live and work in my district. The entire community of Houston-Harris County is benefited: laborers, railroad men, chemical and oil workers, bankers, port officials, and all others related to commerce. In addition, professional men, such as lawyers processing the claims of the waterfront people; the industrial workers, manufacturing the goods that flow through the port; accountants, servicing the stevedoring firms; and hence, indirectly, every person living or working in the area, enjoy the fruits of free trade.

In 1966, a total of \$416.3 million worth of exports were manufactured in Houston, primarily food products, chemicals, petroleum and coal products, crude and fabricated metal products, and machinery. The total employ-

ment in these particular industries is about 91,000. An estimate of the number of these people whose jobs are directly attributable to exports is nearly 70,000. This is in addition to all those mentioned above whose jobs are in the actual trade aspect of the flow of goods and services through Houston. Thus, about 20% or more of the total employment in my district would be jeopardized if the protectionists had their way.

The last point I would like to make is in support of the elimination of the American Selling Price system. If we were to ignore all other reasons for doing so, we would still be compelled to do away with ASP solely to help elicit the cooperation of our friends abroad in speeding up their Kennedy Round tariff reductions. The concessions thus gained will far outweigh any possible disadvantages arising from the repeal of ASP. But aside from that, the fact remains that the industries protected by ASP no longer need the extent of protection which it affords. The rates are extraordinarily high and not in keeping with the spirit of growing international trade and cooperation. The American manufacturer has an almost unheard of advantage in being able to set his prices and having the tariff on competing goods follow from it. It should be noted that the industries covered by ASP are very healthy and growing. Profits and investment are high, and employment is largely unaffected by imports as many of the benzenoid products being produced only for internal use. One must also question the necessity of ASP when, in 1964, \$300 million of benzenoid products were exported as opposed to \$50 million worth of imports, of which half did not compete with any American-made product. Protective tariffs for the affected industries will not be eliminated entirely, rather just brought in line with the rest of the United States tariff schedule.

I subscribe to the old adage, "No man is an island"—neither is a nation, today. We abandoned the policy of isolationism a half century ago; America must not become an island unto itself. Our country and its people deserve the benefits of the free intercourse of goods, services and ideas among nations.

ARMY SERGEANT DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Audrey J. Cook, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

ARMY SERGEANT DIES IN VIETNAM—CITY GI FATALLY WOUNDED WHILE FIGHTING BLAZE

A 20-year-old Army sergeant from Baltimore has been killed in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

He was Sgt. Audrey J. Cook, husband of Mrs. Anita V. Cook, of 1421 Harford avenue.

Sergeant Cook died Tuesday morning after being wounded while fighting a forest fire, his wife said.

IN VIETNAM 6 MONTHS

A paratrooper, he had been in Vietnam six months and had spent all of his time out in the field. His wife said he wrote that he had not had a chance yet to visit any of the cities.

A native of Baltimore, Sergeant Cook had attended Carver-Vocational Technical High School.

He worked as a laborer before enlisting in the Army thirteen months ago.

Sergeant Cook was stationed first at Fort Bragg, N.C., before going to Fort Gordon,

Ga., for his paratroop training. He was sent to Vietnam from Fort Dix, N.J.

In addition to his wife, Sergeant Cook is survived by his mother, Mrs. Louise McArthur; his father, Arthur Cook; two brothers, Kenneth Robinson and Stanley McArthur, and five sisters, Theresa, Patricia, Shella, Sharon and Penny Robinson, all of Baltimore.

MRS. BRUCE B. BENSON: PORTRAIT OF LEADERSHIP

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to congratulate Mrs. Bruce B. Benson of Amherst, Mass., upon her election to the national presidency of the League of Women Voters. As she approaches the beginning of her third month in that office, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the splendid manner in which she has proceeded to guide her great organization toward its goal of more direct involvement with the pressing issues facing citizens and their Government today.

The League of Women Voters has indeed been known for its direct confrontation of specific problems in political life. But equally as significant for the league under Mrs. Benson's fine leadership is its emphasis on brave individual initiative as the best way of achieving that confrontation. Mrs. Benson's own story is that of a concerned citizen who learned the skills of communication with people in government through her determination to reach solutions legally and to right political wrongs effectively. She emphasizes and exemplifies the importance of self-confidence and diplomacy as tools for every citizen to apply in political life.

The launching of the organization's first nationwide financial campaign in January is yet another tribute to Mrs. Benson's balanced foresight. Well may the League of Women Voters prosper under her guidance, as she continues to open horizons of financial stability and devotion to the principles of individual involvement that strengthen our democratic way of life.

An article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1968]

SHE'S A VERY POLITICAL PERSON
(By Lucia Mouat)

CHICAGO.—Officially she's neither a Republican nor a Democrat. But her political influence is that much the stronger for it.

Mrs. Bruce Benson, the new 1968-70 president of the League of Women Voters (LWV) of the United States, concedes that the League's ban on party activity by group officers is sometimes very hard on her—"I'm a very political person."

But this refreshingly candid League leader, who frequently interrupts an interview with "I must stop being so frank," has only to look at her own record to assure herself there may be more action out of a party than in one. She first joined the local League in Amherst, Mass., where her husband is a professor of physics at Amherst College, in 1950. But it was not until 1957 when she was debating between the merits of going back

for her Ph.D. in history or of joining a League committee on loyalty and security that the commitment grew deep. She opted for the committee work. One thing led to another—"I was having a terrifically interesting time"—and by 1961 she was elected president of the LWV of Massachusetts.

It was in that role that Lucy Benson led the state's more than 12,000 League members in a time-consuming, energetic fight to curb the powers of the Governor's Council. Most of the 13 original states which had such councils as buffers between the king and his appointed governors had long ago eliminated them. Massachusetts, however, had not only kept its Council but given it additional powers. There the Council approved all gubernatorial appointments and contracts for roads, waterways, and the like. Admittedly, corruption in the Council, rife at the time of the League's petition drive for a referendum on the question, worked in LWV favor.

"We were on the side of the angels," comments Mrs. Benson. "But our reason for fighting was not the corruption. The Council was interfering with the role of the Governor and he could not be held accountable for his appointments since the Council had to approve them."

VAST CHANGE IN ATMOSPHERE

In the end, voters essentially stripped the Council of its statutory powers. It still approves the Governor's judicial appointments but Mrs. Benson, with understandable satisfaction, reports a "vast change in atmosphere" since the cutback action.

In her non-partisan political career, Mrs. Benson has also served on more than a half-dozen gubernatorial study commissions in Massachusetts, ranging in subject from state employee salaries to the effects of racial imbalance in the schools. One commission on which she served drafted a bill, now law, which gave the University of Massachusetts fiscal autonomy.

On the telephone stand in her hotel room here, where she was interviewed, stood a Charlie Brown card with the caption, "Lucy for First Lady." It had been given her by the outgoing national League president. Mrs. Benson is the first to admit that the three days a week in Washington that her new job entails will have its complications. She will be farther away from home for larger chunks of time than before. But, giving credit where it's due, she says her husband has not only refrained from discouraging her, but he has actively encouraged her to follow her League interests.

"There have been times when he hasn't been the least bit happy, but I've never detected any feeling on his part that I shouldn't do precisely what I want to do," she says. "He has had to put up with an awful lot." Indeed, Mrs. Benson says she wishes other League husbands would be as supportive of their wives' activities.

She says she thinks the effectiveness of League workers, which varies so from town to town and state to state, is closely related to diplomacy and assurance. "You have to be able to relate to others even though they may be opposed to your views," she explains. "Many women in the League lack self-confidence. This is where husbands can do a lot. As a League member, you've got to be able to stand up to all the gaff you get."

Mrs. Benson, in her own down-to-earth brand of eloquence, stresses that she thinks the League's strength lies in its use of traditional procedures.

"If I'm occasionally impatient with the slowness of the League—it took us four years to come to some consensus on equality of opportunity—I'm heartened by the solidity of the position and the democracy in the process used to reach it."

CROSS SECTION OF WOMEN

"If it's a hot subject, you run the risk of having your consensus weakened by those

who are more conservative," adds the League leader who describes herself as more liberal than most League positions, "but I think most of our positions are not badly watered down as a result. If the League were the Civil Liberties Union, our position on civil rights would probably be much stronger, but the League represents a nationwide cross section of women (some 150,000 of them) working at all levels of government in a wide variety of fields. And they're mainly interested in getting things done."

She says she was "enormously relieved" at the conclusion of the recent national League convention in Chicago to see the rift temporarily resolved between those who want the League to focus strictly on government structure and those who want a broader approach to governmental problems. The latter group came out on top.

In January the League will launch its first nationwide financial campaign in connection with its 50th anniversary. Mrs. Benson, who describes herself as "ever the optimist," says she is confident the League will reach its \$11 million goal. It will be used to expand League work in citizen education, publications, and staff.

"Extraordinarily able League women spend a lot of time mimeographing and stuffing envelopes," says the LWV president. "You can get overwhelmed with that sort of thing."

Mrs. Benson is a graduate of Smith College and holder of a two-year fellowship in 1965-66 at the Radcliffe Institute for Independent Study where she studied the politics of the civil rights movement. She has received a number of civic awards in Massachusetts since her involvement with the League.

She finds her organizational work fascinating and says it has crystallized her views in many fields. In fact, once in a while, when she and her husband get into too lively a discussion on national or international issues, one of the couple's two English spaniels will dash for Mr. Benson's lap as one way of toning the discussion down.

"From that point on, we have to speak in soft, dulcet tones," says Mrs. Benson.

GUARANTEED DAILY STEAK

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend A. D. King has apparently taken up where his brother left off. A recent article from the New York Daily News points out that Reverend King "treated 96 dungareed poor people's demonstrators" to a meal at the Statler Hilton's Steak House and then failed to provide for the bill. They offered \$196 to cover a \$590 expense.

It also seemed to be a problem of Martin Luther King that he thought the rest of the world was made of money—someone else's—and it belonged to him and his followers. Seldom is there the consideration of the poor people who would exist if they did not work at the Statler Hilton and if the rest of the world did not pay the bills that contribute to these employees' salaries and wages.

One expects as the next logical step a fervent cry for guaranteed daily steak, provided by the Statler Hilton.

It is also interesting to note that this same article reports an incident between police and youths from Resurrection City.

After police responded to a hail of "sticks, bottles, canned goods and 'anything they could get their hands on'" by outfitting themselves with shotguns and tear-gas equipment, the Reverend James Bevel sloughed the incident off with the statement that the confrontation could be blamed on immature young people and a fantastic reaction by the police.

I wonder what Bevel would say about Reverend King's activities?

The article follows:

DR. KING'S BROTHER TREATS 96 TO STEAK, CAN'T PAY

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Martin Luther King's brother walked out without paying \$392 of a \$590 steak dinner bill run up by himself and 96 dungareed poor people's demonstrators after yesterday's mass rally, it was disclosed today.

The incident occurred when the Rev. A. D. King, who had been turned away from the Statler Hilton hotel's Steak House earlier for not wearing a coat and tie, returned at closing time with his friends from Resurrection City.

The hotel rounded up waiters and kitchen help who had been preparing to go home for the night, and served them 97 steak dinners. At the end of the meal, he was presented a bill for \$590.

"INCIDENT CLOSED"

"Rev. King said all they had was \$198," Harry Soghigian, a hotel spokesman, said. "The hotel felt it best not to make a stink about it, so the manager told them if that was all they had, it would do. As far as the hotel is concerned, the incident is closed."

It was the third time since the Poor People's March began in May that large groups from Resurrection City have ordered meals, then left without paying.

The earlier bills subsequently were paid in full by March leaders.

Early today, six Negroes returning to Resurrection City from the Statler Hilton told an officer that they planned to "get" a park policeman.

Police said they were unable to disperse the six and called for reinforcements. About 50 District of Columbia and park police responded. At this point, the youths retreated to the hut city and re-emerged with about 25 companions wielding sticks and other makeshift weapons.

The officers said the youths hurled sticks, bottles, canned goods and "anything they could get their hands on" at the policemen. The officers at that point were issued shotguns and teargas equipment.

YOUTHS RETREAT

The youths subsequently faded back into resurrection city, police said. Authorities said they used no weapons during the incident.

The Rev. James Bevel, an official of the Poor People's Campaign, later blamed the confrontation on the "immaturity of some of our young people and a fantastic over-reaction by police."

A SALUTE TO LEE MORSE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee Morse, a very able young man, has left the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee. He resigned his position as counsel to the committee to enter the

private practice of law here in Washington.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Mr. Morse for the very valuable contributions he made to the work of the committee during the past 4 years. I am sure that all of my colleagues on the committee join me in commending him for his splendid service and in wishing him every success in his law practice.

FAR TOO MANY BEANBALLS THROWN AT AMERICA TODAY

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in the June 11 issue of the New York Daily Column, Jim Murray, the sports columnist contributed a powerfully written article regarding conditions in the United States as evidenced by the tragic death of Senator Kennedy.

So that our colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. Murray's message, which is projected toward everyone even though expressed in the sports idiom, I place his article entitled, "Far Too Many Beanballs Thrown at America Today," at this point in the Record:

FOR TOO MANY BEANBALLS THROWN AT
AMERICA TODAY
(By Jim Murray)

I was going to write to you about fun and games today—a golf match at Lake Tahoe, Nev., a track meet in a municipal amphitheater.

But once again America the Beautiful has taken a bullet to the groin. The country is in surgery. The Violent States of America. One bullet is mightier than one million votes.

It's not a Democracy, it's a Lunacy. A country that shrinks from punishing its criminals, disciplining its children, locking up its mad. It's like an animal that disregards its senses. It's a lamb defending the lion's right to eat it.

Democracy is in the cross-hairs. The Assassination Party wins elections without going in a primary. The President of the United States is chosen in a hardware store, a mail order catalogue. We blame Dallas, but it's no good. It happens everywhere. Memphis, Los Angeles. The United States.

We quarantine the good, the reliable, the honest. We keep a 24-hour watch on the trustworthy, but get a habeas corpus to let anarchy loose.

Freedom is being gunned down. The "right" to murder is the ultimate right in this country. Sloth is a virtue. Patriotism is a sin. Conservation is an anachronism. God is over 30 years old. To be young is the only religion—as if it were a hard-won virtue. "Decency" is dirty feet, a scorn for work. "Love" is something you need penicillin for. "Love" is handing a flower to a naked young man with vermin in his hair while your mother sits home with a broken heart. You "love" strangers, not parents.

I will be severely criticized, even ridiculed for crying out. "Lousy sportswriter, what does he know?" I can hear it said, "Who does he think he is. Paul Harvey?" "Fulton J. Murray," still others will sneer. This is the 20th Century, they will say, not Disneyland. We'll, it's getting to look more like the Cave Man Era every day from this seat. Americans who have a podium should use it today.

I like people with curtains on the window, not people with "pads." The next guy that calls money "bread" should be paid off in whole wheat. I'm sick of being told I should try to "understand" evil. Should a canary "understand" a cat?

These are some of the things, it seems to me, that has put blood on the walls of America. The next funeral procession will be for the Republic itself. The American Dream will be rolling up Pennsylvania Ave. behind the roll of drums. It will be buried in Arlington. The Constitution was never conceived as a shield for degeneracy. You start out burning the flag and you end up burning Detroit. You do away with the death penalty for everyone but presidential candidates—and Presidents. The national symbol is not the eagle, it's the catafalque.

The point of the country is Fear. The rebellion is against good. Men of God become men of the Mob. The National Anthem is a scream in the night. Americans can't walk in their own parks, get on their own buses. They have to cage themselves.

"Get off your knees, America!" people cry, but it is ignored. Bare your teeth, they say. Threaten to fight back. The lion bares his teeth and the jackals slink away. A cowering animal invites attack. But America is not listening.

These are the things it seems to me, that put a young senator, a servant of his people into the shadow of death.

It all begins with that—the defilement of drifters, wastrels, poltroons—insolent guests at the gracious table of democracy overturning it on their dismayed hosts.

What have the Kennedys ever done to deserve ambushes every five years at the hands of people they ask only to serve? What apology can we offer to a noble family except to resolve to stop being ruled by our refuse, our human refuse that is? How many good men have to die before we wrest weapons from the terrible hands of our barbarians, demand respect for our institutions, stop glorifying hate?

DISARMAMENT LOBBY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a straightforward and timely comment concerning the efforts of some to deny ownership of firearms to our citizens recently appeared in the Sunday Advocate's sports column, "Afieled and Afloat," and I ask that it be here reproduced followed by the Dan Smoot Report for August 22, 1966, and a retrogressive policy statement by the Secretary of the Army dated June 21, 1968, along with several related articles.

With the Army's surrender to the emotional outcry of the extremely vocal "disarmament lobby," the only remaining nationwide organization promoting safe gun handling and responsible ownership of weapons, is the National Rifle Association.

The material referred to, follows:

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Sunday Advocate, June 16, 1968]

AFIELD AND AFLOAT—MASS HYSTERIA

(By Hurley L. Campbell)

Since the untimely death of Senator Kennedy at the hands of an alien the nation seems to be in the grip of a kind of hysteria that says the complete abolishing of all guns will automatically make things right again.

It started only hours after he was struck down by the bullet from a gun wielded by a foreigner who had been allowed to stay in our country for some 11 years without even an attempt to become a citizen—a situation, I must confess, that has me baffled as to the laws covering such cases.

The national TV newsmen were the first to take up the cry—Ban All Guns! Hour after hour they filled the airwaves with pious spoutings about firearms and the crime rate, and the "sickness" of our society.

Never once did I hear one say anything about the influence of the boob tube on society and the behavior of same. Never once did I hear a cry about the violence, riots, looting, almost pornography that comes over the airwaves daily having possible effect on the minds of children who watch the trash.

Nope, all I heard were the solemn words proclaiming all guilt on a "sick" society and demanding that all guns be taken from the hands of the citizens of the nation.

Not a word about the abridgment of laws that were made to contain criminals; not a word about the cesspool of movie production that gives forth with the trash offered the American public today (a cesspool, I might add, that makes national heroes of Bonnie and Clyde instead of portraying them as the insane killers they really were); not a word about the interpretation of laws that ties the hands of the police in their attempts to force people to live by the laws of the land; not a word about the daily dose of looting and violence that makes up the major portion of the so-called news programs of the networks; not a word about the pornographic trash that fills many of the newsstands of the nation under the guise of magazines; not a word about court decisions that allow confessed murderers to go free on technicalities; not a word about the moral laxity that has swept the nation, fostered in part by much of the things listed above—nope, not a word did I hear that indicated any of these things might be to blame for the so-called "sickness" of our society.

Only the gun was to blame as far as national news commentators were concerned!

So we have a rash of proposed gun laws being introduced in the national Congress—even in our own legislature. All accompanied by grandiose oratory proclaiming each to be the savior of the nation, the only step that will cause violence within our borders to cease.

The latest on the national scene comes from Senator Tydings of Maryland and calls for complete registration of all firearms under penalty of a fine of \$10,000 plus a sentence of 10 years in prison!

His proposal in the light of the fact that the Supreme Court forced law officers to turn loose a number of confessed murderers on strictly technical points of law during the past years seems a bit asinine to me.

Too, a proclamation by the Postmaster-General during the week stated the firearms couldn't be shipped by mail unless plainly marked and that local postmasters would have to notify the local police before they could make delivery of guns even when properly marked.

When you realize that there have been no laws passed by the Congress that call for such measures then you begin to see that mobs of demonstrators aren't the only ones who attempt to take the law into their own hands in our nation—obeying those they want to obey, breaking those they don't like.

Everything is aimed at the inanimate gun—nothing seems to be aimed at the criminal who used the gun to commit crimes!

As always, the argument is one which compares the registration of cars to the proposed registration of guns, a measure which will completely circumvent the second amendment to the constitution.

Pray tell me—has the registration of auto-

mobiles done anything to stop the carnage on our highways? Seems to me the last statistics I saw showed that 8-10 times as many people were killed by cars as were killed by guns, even in war!

Registration of cars hasn't stopped accidents and death from their use—only the "nut behind the wheel" can control that aspect of the situation! The same argument applies to the gun—the user controls it and it does what he bids it do!

Registration of automobiles hasn't stopped the theft of vehicles with more than 600,000 cases of same reported last year. Again, I contend that the criminal will get guns while the law-abiding citizen suffers, registration or no!

Seems to me I remember that our national congress, in very recent weeks in fact, failed to pass a law that would have put real teeth into the demands of citizens that more safety devices be installed on new automobiles—so highway deaths continue to mount in numbers.

The National Rifle Association, a million members strong, is the whipping dog as far as national publicity is concerned. It has been branded everything in the books because it has stood strong for the rights granted our citizens by the constitution yet each and every speaker fails to point out that NRA has for many years been strong advocates of laws to contain the easy accessibility of handguns! A law, I might add, backed to the hilt by sportsmen of the nation. A law just passed by Congress last week!

I believe that one of the most significant statements made over TV after the shooting of Senator Kennedy was made by the Chief of Police of Los Angeles in answer to a newsmen's question as to whether or not he favored strong legislative control of guns. A statement, I might add, that was never repeated by the commentators although they rehearsed every other word spoken by the chief when they had to fill empty time slots.

He stated that he was a strong supporter of the Senator Thomas Dodd gun control bill in Congress. In the very next breath he further stated, "I will admit, however, that even had the Dodd bill been in effect it could not have prevented this tragedy!"

You see, Los Angeles already has strong gun control laws on the books of the city. The gun used by the assassin was traced because it was a registered handgun.

But the user of the gun brought about the situation we now face!

Always take a boy fishing with you!

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Aug. 22, 1966, Dallas, Tex.]

THE RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

Since the assassination of President Kennedy in November, 1963, Congress has considered several bills to provide more stringent federal firearms control. The bill given most consideration is S. 1592, originally introduced by Senator Thomas Dodd on August 2, 1963, revised and reintroduced on March 22, 1965.

As revised and approved by a Senate Subcommittee on April 1, 1966, the Dodd bill became the only federal firearms proposal likely to be seriously considered during the present session. The possibility that Congress would pass the Dodd bill in 1966 was virtually non-existent until August 1, when Charles Joseph Whitman (a Floridian who was a student at the University of Texas) shot 46 persons in Austin (15 of whom died). Before shooting the 46, Whitman had stabbed his wife to death, murdered his mother with a gun.

President Johnson demanded quick passage of the Dodd firearms bill, saying "the time has come for action before further loss of life that might be prevented by its passage."¹ The President failed to note that the

Dodd bill would not have prevented the grisly affair in Austin. In the arsenal which Whitman took to the University of Texas tower for his orgy of murder was a sawed-off shotgun—a weapon which was "outlawed" 32 years ago by the National Firearms Act of 1934. Another of Whitman's guns was a pistol: his taking this weapon to the University of Texas tower was a violation of Texas law.

Senator Dodd urged immediate consideration of his gun-control bill. While conceding that the bill would not prevent such "senseless murders" as those committed by Whitman, Dodd said it would be a deterrent. He mentioned New York State's Sullivan law as a deterrent.² He did not mention that, last year, in New York City alone, there were 631 "senseless murders," 1154 rapes, 16,325 assaults.³ Not long ago, a girl was arrested in New York City for violating the Sullivan law by using a switchblade knife to defend herself against a rapist. More recently, another girl was arrested and jailed for using a tear-gas pen to protect herself against a man who molested her in a restaurant. It is obvious that the Sullivan law does not deter, but encourages, crimes of violence. It does not keep weapons from criminals and maniacs, but does prevent law-abiding citizens from carrying guns or anything else for self-protection in the sprawling metropolitan jungles teeming with marauding savages.

Practically all advocates of more federal gun-control laws joined with President Johnson and Senator Dodd to capitalize on the widespread feeling of horror caused by the Austin massacre. Many mentioned the murder of eight nurses in Chicago as further reason for Congress to enact the Dodd gun-control law—omitting to mention that Richard Speck murdered the nurses without a gun.

Actually, the mass murders committed by Speck and Whitman prove that citizens should have easy access to firearms and should know how to use them in defense of themselves and others. If any or all of the girls whom Speck murdered had had access to guns they knew how to use, some of them might have been saved.

In the Whitman case, high-powered rifles in the hands of university students did save a number of lives. When police first arrived on the scene, Whitman was standing boldly on the University tower's observation platform, resting his gun on the guard rail, deliberately picking off everyone who came into his sights. He would have been an easy target from the ground, but was out of range of police guns. The police asked for help from students who owned hunting rifles. Two students, who had deer rifles and knew how to use them, volunteered. Using binoculars, police directed the fire of the two students. Whitman took cover behind the guard rail and never again presented a target the boys could hit; but their fire pinned him down and made possible the evacuation of wounded.⁴ Fire from students on the ground also helped make it possible for three policemen and a civilian volunteer to force their way onto the observation platform and take Whitman by surprise.

We do need—as Senator Dodd says—some deterrents against crimes of violence. The best deterrent would be a citizenry armed and able to defend itself. There can be no doubt that crimes of violence would decrease sharply if it became commonplace for thugs to be killed by their intended victims. Another effective deterrent would be rigid punishment, under existing law, of criminals who prey on others. A recently-released FBI study revealed that 68,850 convicted criminals who had been given leniency (probation, suspended sentence, parole, or conditional re-

lease) averaged three arrests each following the leniency that was granted them. The FBI study concluded:

"Far too many criminals are exploiting leniency to prey on innocent citizens. Too much foolish sentimentalism on the part of judges, probation officers and others is bringing injurious results."⁵

Texas Governor John Connally has suggested a sensible deterrent against crimes of violence. He said:

"I'm seriously considering recommending to the legislature that whenever a serious crime, involving loss of life . . . occurs, that the perpetrator be incarcerated for life and never released."

"Any man who willfully kills another and escapes punishment on the basis of insanity ought to be incarcerated for life."⁶

The Dodd gun-control bill (S. 1592) would give federal officials unlimited power to impose harsh and burdensome restrictions on all law-abiding citizens who sell, possess, or use firearms. The power could be used to require national registration, or even to eliminate private ownership of guns by law-abiding persons; but it would never keep criminals from getting and using destructive devices.

Indeed, the Dodd bill provides no penalties for criminals who use guns in the commission of crime. The penalties are aimed at lawful sellers and users of guns. In this regard, the Dodd bill is identical with two federal firearms statutes already in existence: The National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. The 1934 law was intended to restrict possession and interstate transportation of certain types of firearms: submachine guns, sawed-off shotguns, guns with silencers. The 1938 law prohibits interstate transportation of any kind of gun to any person who has been convicted of, or is under indictment for, a crime of violence; who is a fugitive from justice; or who does not present proof that he is licensed to purchase a gun, if the purchaser lives in a state requiring a gun license. But neither law provides penalties for persons who use guns to commit crimes.

The pending Dodd bill has something else in common with the 1934 and 1938 federal firearms-control statutes: it is unconstitutional.

The Second Amendment to the Constitution says:

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

This is an absolute prohibition against any kind of federal firearms law, because any such law clearly infringes upon the specified right of the people. Consequently, all existing federal firearms laws and all now being proposed are unconstitutional.

Today, we have more restrictive firearms regulations than ever before in the history of the United States; and today, there are more crimes of violence (more in actual number, and more in proportion to the total population). This is not coincidental; it is inevitable. Criminal violence against law-abiding citizens will always increase, as citizens are restricted in their right to defend themselves.

A free man must have unrestricted right to own and use personal weapons, in defense of his family, his home, and his own person, against any marauder—whether the marauder be a soldier of an invading army, an agent of an internal political conspiracy, or a common criminal.

If a man loses his right to free, lawful use of personal firearms, he loses his identity as a free agent in a civilized country. He becomes

² "Panel To Ponder Gun Control Bill," *The Dallas Times Herald*, August 7, 1966, p. 12A.

³ "Crime In The U.S.: Still Climbing," *U.S. News & World Report*, March 21, 1966, p. 16.

⁴ "Building Presented Hard Shot," *The Dallas Morning News*, August 3, 1966, p. 7A.

⁵ "The Habitual Offender—FBI Blames Leniency," *U.S. News & World Report*, August 8, 1966, p. 8.

⁶ "Probation Rules Said Inadequate," *The Dallas Times Herald*, August 4, 1966, p. 1.

¹ *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, August 5, 1966, p. 1696.

totally dependent upon centralized police authority for protection of his life, liberty, and property.

A citizen's right to keep and bear arms is so essential to freedom that tyranny must follow if it is abrogated.

Nikolai Lenin and Adolf Hitler—experts at enslaving large segments of the human race—understood clearly that a well-armed citizenry is a mighty handicap to dictators.

Lenin said:

"It is only after we have disarmed the bourgeoisie, that the proletariat, without betraying its world historic mission, can turn its weapons into ploughshares. And that is the way the proletariat will act—but only then, and by no means before."⁷

Hitler said:

"The most foolish mistake we could possibly make would be to allow the subject races to possess arms. History shows that all conquerors who have allowed their subject races to carry arms have prepared their own downfall by so doing."⁸

Requiring national registration of personally-owned firearms can be as disastrous to freedom as total disarmament of the citizenry.

In May, 1919, a group of allied intelligence officers raided the headquarters of a revolutionary group in Dusseldorf, Germany. One document seized was entitled "Rules for Bringing About A Revolution." Three basic rules were set out. The first involved corruption of the young by instilling in them contempt for religion and traditional morality. The second involved capturing means of communication so that revolutionists could control the thinking of the people and the programs of government. The third rule read:

"Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless."⁹

France had a national gun-registration law before World War II. Nazis confiscated the records and the guns, making effective resistance impossible.

It was a firearms registration-and-control law which enabled communists to disarm Czechoslovakians, thus leaving them helpless when communists decided to take over.

Many Americans remember the impassioned pleas of the British for personal firearms to defend their homes and families in 1940, when a Nazi invasion of England seemed imminent. The British had been disarmed by their own government, with severe firearms control regulations.

Many Americans also remember that, when our Armies overran Europe toward the end of World War II, we immediately confiscated and used, wherever possible, the lists of people who had been forced by their own government to register their firearms.

One firearms bill presently before Congress is aimed at the proper target—criminal use of firearms. On March 2, 1965, U.S. Representative Robert R. Casey (Texas Democrat) introduced H.R. 5642, a bill providing that, "whoever uses or carries any firearm during the commission of any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnapping, or homicide (other than involuntary manslaughter)" shall be sentenced to 25 years in prison.

In support of his bill, Representative Casey said:

"I ask this Congress to stop the harassment of the legitimate gun owner—and instead to open war on the illegal use of firearms by the criminal preying on society."

The Casey firearms bill is the only kind of firearms legislation desirable in a free society; but, as a federal law, it, too, would be unconstitutional. Responsibility for restrict-

ing criminal use of firearms belongs to local and state governments.

Please write both U.S. Senators from your state and the U.S. Representative from your district, urging them to oppose the unconstitutional Dodd bill (S 1592) which would restrict law-abiding citizens in their right to defend themselves, but would not prevent criminal use of deadly weapons.

If you think additional legislation is needed to curtail criminal use of firearms in your state, you should work for legislation comparable to the Casey bill (mentioned above) at the state level.

Suggestion: Distribute copies of this Report as widely as possible, urging others to write members of Congress expressing opposition to the Dodd gun-control bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1968.

MARKSMANSHIP SUPPORT IS LIMITED

Information for Members of Congress:

The Secretary of the Army, who is charged by law with conducting a civilian marksmanship program, approved a revised program limiting support of civilian marksmanship.

In the past, the marksmanship program included support with weapons and ammunition of junior rifle clubs and senior rifle and pistol clubs, support of the National Rifle Matches, and a sales program of excess rifles under a statute providing for such sales to National Rifle Association members.

The support for the pistol program will be terminated, new restrictions will be imposed on distribution and sale of rifles and ammunition, and the rifle club program will be modified.

A committee of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, which is a military-civilian body established by statutes, was appointed in February 1968 to make recommendations to the Board for a revised program. That committee reported to the full Board in March 1968, and the Board in turn made its recommendations to the Secretary of the Army. The revised program approved by the Secretary considered the recommendations of the Board and was also based upon a review of the marksmanship program initiated by the Department of the Army in mid-1967. It reflects both the reduced budget for civilian marksmanship announced last January and a long-range effort to make the allocation of resources devoted to the program more relevant to military requirements.

Under the revised program, support for marksmanship clubs will be limited to those clubs most of whose members still have their service obligation ahead of them and whose marksmanship training would be of greatest value to the military services. Those are the junior clubs, the junior divisions of senior clubs, and undergraduate college clubs.

No ammunition will be issued to senior clubs although those senior clubs which support a junior division may retain the use of rifles previously issued. If senior clubs are not supporting a junior division by December 31, 1968, they will lose affiliation with the marksmanship program and must turn in rifles previously issued.

Sales of firearms under the civilian marksmanship program will be restricted to National Match grade service rifles, specially designed for competitive marksmanship. Sales will be made only to individuals who are active in regular competitive marksmanship and who are members of marksmanship clubs affiliated with the Army's Director of Civilian Marksmanship. Purchasers must also be members of the National Rifle Association, as required by statute.

In accordance with existing Army procedures, all purchasers will be checked for criminal record and other disqualifying

characteristics in the files of appropriate Federal and local law enforcement agencies.

Sales of ammunition to individuals will be terminated, although junior clubs affiliated with the program will be allowed to purchase a limited quantity of .22 caliber ammunition.

Previously, on 1 November 1967, the Secretary of the Army announced that in order to reduce expenditures the Army would not supply personnel and financial support for the 1968 National Rifle Matches.

Furnished by: Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

[Report of STROM THURMOND, June 24, 1968]

PROPER GUN CONTROL

In recent days there has been renewed interest in Federal gun control legislation and pressure on the Congress to enact new laws. It is the responsibility of Congress to see that any such legislation carefully considers the jurisdiction of the states and that of the Federal government in this crucial area.

State Level. The states and local governments have the primary responsibility for keeping the peace. This responsibility includes the authority to enact and enforce gun legislation appropriate to their needs. Such legislation could provide for severe prison terms for persons committing crimes with a gun or for penalties for carrying a concealed weapon without a license or legal permission. The states even have the power to provide for registration of firearms, if deemed advisable. States and localities have law enforcement personnel to enforce gun legislation.

Law abiding citizens should be allowed to keep guns in their homes for the protection of their families and property.

Existing state and local laws should be enforced vigorously.

Federal Level. The role of the Federal government in gun control legislation should be limited to assisting states to enforce their laws by regulating interstate shipment of firearms. The use of interstate commerce to circumvent state laws should be prohibited.

Federal laws should regulate rather than prohibit interstate shipment of firearms. Federal law should make it illegal to ship a gun across state lines without an affidavit of eligibility from the purchaser and notification by the shipper to the chief local law enforcement officer where the purchaser resides. Such officer should have a reasonable time in which to notify the shipper if the purchase violates state law.

A Federal system of gun registration and licensing would require a large Federal police force. A Federal police force could lead to a police state.

Conditions and traditions vary widely from state to state, and the needs of one state should not necessarily be imposed upon another. The Federal government should take no measures which pressure or require states to adopt uniform Federal standards.

Federal law should strictly regulate destructive devices such as bazookas and mortars, in the same manner as it now regulates machine guns, short-barreled shotguns and short-barreled rifles.

Existing Federal laws should be enforced vigorously.

Enforcement. Although proper gun legislation is essential, the gun is merely an instrument of crime; the real cause of crime is criminals, who today are operating in an atmosphere of permissiveness and arrogance. Supreme Court decisions have severely handicapped the police in the apprehension of criminals, and diminished the power of the courts to see that the guilty are punished.

The decline of law enforcement in the country is apparent from some shocking statistics: Only 1 lawbreaker in 8 is tried and convicted; of all persons arrested in 1966, 76% were repeat offenders. In Washington,

⁷ Pamphlet, National Rifle Association, circa 1963.

⁸ *The American Rifleman*, August, 1946, p. 31.

D.C., harried police are able to arrest only one-quarter of the perpetrators of crimes, whereas a decade ago they caught one-half.

Just as shocking is the rate of criminal repeaters—lawbreakers who are turned loose to prey again upon society. A recent FBI study of some 18,000 convicts released in 1963 revealed that fully 55% had been re-arrested for new offenses by June 30, 1966. Criminals are increasingly defying the law successfully, and public confidence in our administration of justice is diminishing.

Our crime and gun problem would largely come under control if conviction rates were doubled and sentences were more severe. The chief keys to the gun control problem are swift apprehension and certain punishment for those who violate the law.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

LIBERTY LOBBY,

Washington, D.C., June 18, 1968.

HON. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: Keeping your head while all about you are losing theirs can get to be quite a trick, sometimes. In the case of firearms control laws, I like the advice of Senator McCarthy, who advocates such laws, but who warns against "panic" legislation. No matter how you feel about the need for such laws, there are certain political factors which tend to be overlooked by some who are urging great haste.

For one thing, the Harris and Gallup polls. Because of their regional basis, they can be misleading. They are not broken down by State or Congressional District.

It is interesting to note that the constituent-poll results entered in the Congressional Record so far this year have contradicted the results of the Harris and Gallup polls on the question of Federal firearms laws. In some cases, the ratio of responses against such laws ran more than two-to-one. If nothing else, this indicates the "depth"—or intensity—of feeling against such laws, as opposed to the "breadth" of feeling reflected in the professional polls. (Intensity—I am sure you will agree—is very important. It is the motivational force in politics.)

Another factor bearing on the professional polls is that they reveal great variations in gun ownership in inverse ratio to population density. Only 27% of city homes have guns, rising to 47% of suburban home and 58% of homes in towns. Obviously, it matters whether your constituency is made up of one or the other.

Then, there is the matter of timing. From here, in the wake of the assassination of a leading public figure, it appears that all around us are ready—even anxious—to submit to any kind of gun control, from registration to outright confiscation. But . . .

Given a few months of normalcy, which in this sad era means a few months of murder, rape and riot, perhaps the 54% of American homes that possess guns will be taking an entirely different view of the matter. They may even come to look upon the family firearm as a friend.

So, please don't move too fast too far too soon. It is a long way to November, and I will cite the words of Louis Harris, himself, who has this to say about polls:

"They are also disturbing if they are viewed as a permanent fix on American public opinion instead of being single snapshots at one point in time . . ."

Liberty Lobby has great faith in the American people. If you and we are successful in plumbing and reflecting the folk-wisdom of the people of this Nation in the performance of our duties, we can't go too far wrong. That is, after all, about the best we can expect of Democracy.

Sincerely,

W. B. HICKS, Jr.,
Executive Secretary.

AN "EXPERT" SPEAKS ON GUN LAWS

(By Charles Lee Howard)

(NOTE.—About the author: Charles Lee Howard, No. 122-596 at Ohio State Penitentiary, comes up for a parole hearing in May, 1975. Meanwhile he is a school librarian there, and has done teaching among inmates although he himself only went through the 11th grade. He wouldn't be writing this article, he says, if he planned to return to crime.)

At 26, I have possessed 20 pistols. And I acquired only one of them in even a semi-legal way. The other 19 were stolen by me or for me by friends.

This may shock those legislators and other nice people who believe that if you make it harder for a target shooter to buy a pistol, you automatically make it harder for the criminal to get one.

But it's old hat to me and my friends. You see, we are not target shooters, handgun hunters, plinkers or collectors. We don't belong to gun clubs or groups of that sort.

We must have pistols because they are the tools of our trade, crime.

We are the ones the anti-gun people want to crack down on by making it hard for old ladies who live alone to buy pistols for self-defense.

I am serving my third felony sentence, writing this from the Ohio State Penitentiary at Columbus. I arrived here Jan. 10, 1966, sentenced to 15 to 55 years on charges of armed robbery and kidnapping.

From inside prison, the anti-gun uproar makes strange reading. It is baffling that the people who want to prevent criminals like me from getting hold of guns expect to accomplish this by passing new laws.

Do they forget that the criminal makes a business of breaking laws? No criminal I know would obey a gun law while committing a crime of equal or greater seriousness.

There must be some things they don't know, these well-intentioned souls who say, "We don't seek to hamper any honest person's enjoyment of firearms; we only want to make it harder for the lawless to acquire them."

Perhaps they don't know that the statute books of most States are already well stocked with laws supposed to limit a felon's right to acquire a concealable weapon—in some cases his right to own any gun at all. The laws are there. But they are seldom enforced.

Perhaps they don't know how criminals do get their guns. Certainly crooks don't buy them, by mail order or over the counter, as do the hunters, target shooters, collectors and people requiring guns for self-protection.

I have spent quite a few years in prison and have known criminals ranging from non-support cases to brutal murderers. From experience I know that only a small minority of those committed for offenses involving guns obtained those guns through legal channels. Most of the guns used by criminals in my "circle" were either stolen outright or bought from shady friends. They weren't bought from the mail-order dealer, that demon of so many seekers after Federal anti-gun legislation.

The criminal who wants a gun doesn't have to look far. He can steal one from a private home, an office, a store, or a car. Bank messengers who carry large sums of money usually are armed. But in communities where it is illegal to carry a concealed weapon on one's person, they have to leave their guns in their cars when they make stops on business. It is easy enough for a crook to learn a bank messenger's route, trail him and, when the messenger makes a stop, lift the gun from the glove compartment or from beneath the seat. A veteran con I know swears he got 6 guns this way in a single day!

These aren't the gun-seeking criminal's only sources of supply. He can "hit" National Guard armories, gun dealers' stores, gun-

smiths' shops, and gun factories. Theft of 46 carbines from a factory near Plainfield, N.J., compounded the dangers faced by police in last summer's rioting.

Stolen guns from all manner of sources abound in the underworld. No kind of gun legislation will take them out of circulation. Nor will it stop professional law-breakers from stealing guns as before.

Consider the situation in New York State, where the Sullivan Law makes handgun ownership difficult for the honest citizen and theoretically impossible for the crook. Has it disarmed the New York gangsters? Of course not. All it has done is to hamper the citizen in his justifiable attempts to protect himself from them. Every thief I've ever met would prefer robbing an unarmed person to tackling an armed one. I, myself, have passed up several lucrative "scores" because I knew the proprietor was armed. Easy money in your pocket is one thing. Risking a bullet for it is something else.

Still another argument against prohibitive gun legislation is that not every Honest John will observe to the letter laws he thinks are unfair and arbitrary. Remember the shot in the arm Prohibition gave crime. At present, under the Sullivan Law, the New York syndicates are making some, but not much, money from gun sales. But they are always looking for new rackets. Let the lawmakers disarm the country and goons will bootleg guns as they once did booze.

Since criminals, not guns, commit crimes, it strikes this convict that taking away one of the citizen's means of self defense is not the best way to protect him. Instead of taking away his gun, I would advocate a nationwide program to teach him how to use it safely and accurately.

Such a program would also brief him on when not to try to stop a robbery. Too many people are killed and injured in ill-advised attempts to frustrate a robbery. A live witness is far more valuable than a brave dead man.

The trained witness of a crime should be able to supply police with such information as the bandit's height; approximate weight; hair color; unusual speech patterns; the way he walks; whether he is right or left-handed; eye color (if the witness can get that close); mode of getaway; his weapon (most bandits use the same gun all the time).

In court, this is the information that leads to convictions. And convictions attack the root of crime—the guilty man, not the guiltless gun.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I send a report home to my constituents in the First District of North Dakota, concerning the activities of Congress and the problems facing our Nation. I include the following report in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 26, 1968.

For the first three months of the year, crime in the nation rose 17% over the same period in 1967.

In the last seven years, crime has increased approximately 88%, while population has increased only 10%.

Crime has increased nearly nine times as fast as population.

The big daddy of all crime—organized crime—continues to flourish, while the battle against it, primarily a Federal Government responsibility, falters. Attorney General Ramsey Clark has stated that organized

crime is a multi-billion dollar operation, but admits "more of their guys (organized crime personnel) are being hurt in auto accidents than by the government."

There is no question that the crime problem facing the nation today is greater than at any time in the past. When testifying before our Appropriations Subcommittee which funds the Justice Department and the FBI, Director J. Edgar Hoover called for the immediate concern and support of all citizens for strict and impartial law enforcement, coupled with the elimination of both organized crime's huge profits and the permissiveness of "soft" justice which encourages the spiraling crime rate.

"We need justice that moves quickly, surely and convincingly," Hoover said. "This means, as I have often pointed out, quick arrest, prompt prosecution and substantial punishment for the guilty . . ."

Those of us who agree that one way to cut down on lawlessness is to make the punishment fit the crime were disturbed when Director M. Alexander of the Federal Prison System told our Committee that Federal prison population is down 12½% from 1962. A recent study revealed that 57% of prisoners released on parole were rearrested within 2½ years and 67% of offenders released early after earning "good time" were also rearrested.

Discussing this problem before our Committee, Director Hoover said: "Realistic parole and probation policies must be impartially employed in all sections of our country and among all segments of our society if we ever hope to stem the onrushing waves of lawlessness. Unwarranted leniency, which demeans justice and rewards evasion of legal responsibility, poses a deadly threat to the very heart of our nation. Undue consideration for the rights of repeating offenders and over-indulgence in legal technicalities and evasions, of benefit only to the lawbreaker, degrade the very ideal of equal justice for all citizens. The rights of the law-abiding majority must be afforded at least equal respect and consideration if the future of America is to be as glorious as our past."

While the bulk of law enforcement authority is reserved for the States under the Tenth Amendment, organized crime sows the seeds of individual crime and combating it demands more active Federal effort. To this end, a number of my colleagues and I joined in researching, writing, and introducing nine bills aimed at curtailing organized crime in our nation. Some of our recommendations were included in the Omnibus Crime Bill signed recently by the President, but a number of the provisions, including special protection for government witnesses, remain bottled up in the Judiciary Committee.

Part of our work was based on the findings of the Presidents' own National Crime Commission, a group which spent eighteen months and \$2 million studying the problem only to have their report ignored to a great extent by the Administration.

Much has been said about the importance of support and cooperation from all responsible citizens in controlling crime. I think all Americans have become concerned. Crime cannot be controlled, however, without appropriate and effective government commitment at all levels—Federal, state and local.

PEACE, EVEN SURVIVAL REQUIRE
REAFFIRMED SUPPORT TO ISRAEL

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today, slightly more than a year after the 6-

CXIV—1199—Part 14

day war of last June, the Middle East appears not less, but more, dangerous than ever.

That is the ominous but realistic conclusion drawn in a thoughtful editorial assessment by the Philadelphia Bulletin.

The Soviet Union continues to pour more and more explosives into the Middle East powder keg while at the same time handing matches to Nasser. As the Bulletin emphasizes:

Another round most certainly would not be a replica of the last one. The United States and Russia managed to stay out of that one but there is now a very real danger of a clash between the two should general fighting be renewed.

Such a military and political adventurer should not be handed the means to trigger an explosion that could end the world. For certainly a nuclear conflict must destroy all that 3,000 years of civilization have painfully created. Albert Einstein was right, of course, when he said:

I do not know with what weapons World War III will be fought, but I do know that World War IV will be fought with rocks.

The Soviet Union must, of course, be prevailed upon by one means or another to halt its rearmament of the Middle East. At the same time neither Nasser nor Russia should be encouraged by an apparent softening in American support to Israel, the one peace-seeking democracy of the Middle East. Our commitments and our pledges to Israel must be reaffirmed and strengthened for the sake of peace in the Middle East and for the sake of civilization's survival. We must clearly see and keep constantly in mind that the Israeli road leads to peace; the Nasser road to disaster.

Mr. President, because it is a penetrating assessment of where we stand and what is at stake today in the Middle East, I ask unanimous consent that the Philadelphia Bulletin editorial entitled "Another June in the Middle East" be printed at this point in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent also that it be followed in the RECORD by a news feature which splendidly reports and illuminates the realities on which the Bulletin editorial was based. This feature, entitled "Terrorists Take Rising Toll of Israel," was published in the Washington Evening Star of June 4.

We should read and take heed.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, June 10, 1968]

ANOTHER JUNE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

At the end of the Middle East war last June, it did not seem possible that the first anniversary of the start of the war would be marked by a new clash between Jordan and Israel, and that it is merely the latest of a series over the past year.

The economic consequences to either side, it was first hoped, would compel Arabs and Israelis at last to reach a live-and-let-live settlement.

With the loss of its richest territory, Jordan was not considered viable as a state and with the loss of revenue from the Suez Canal and other income, Egypt was not in much better shape. But oil-rich Arab countries came to the financial rescue of both nations. The

burden of occupying conquered territory has not been overwhelming to Israel.

Egyptian President Nasser has survived political convulsions and Jordan's King Hussein has had to yield to Arab guerrillas in order to keep his throne. The king has thus halted his efforts to prevent Jordan from being used as a base for repeated attacks against Israel.

By rearming Egypt and building a Mediterranean fleet, Russia has played a key role in encouraging Arabs to continue refusing to recognize Israel and to hold as well to the belief that perhaps another round of fighting would wipe out the state of Israel.

President Nasser talks of recovering lost territories by force rather than using his rearmament as a basis for negotiations with Israel. Patient efforts of Gunnar Jarring, the UN special representative, to find ways to get the two sides to even begin negotiating a settlement have come to naught so far.

Thus, 12 months after the six-day war of last June the Middle East appears, not less, but more dangerous than ever.

Another round most certainly would not be a replica of the last one. The United States and Russia managed to stay out of that one, but there is now a very real danger of a clash between the two should general fighting be renewed.

Last June, the UN Security Council talked of getting to the roots of the trouble between Arabs and Israelis, but all it could come up with was the Jarring mission. The Council should lose no more time listening to charges and countercharges and demand a mutual settlement that will preserve territories and provide Israel with security.

TERRORISTS TAKE RISING TOLL OF ISRAEL

(By Andrew Borowiec)

TEL AVIV.—A police roadblock loomed in the falling darkness and cars streaming toward Jaffe and Tel Aviv slowed down.

The policemen held flashlights into the cars and occasionally asked for identity papers. A machinegun held the highway in check.

That afternoon, two cleaning workers discovered a time bomb in the Mercat movie theater on the outskirts of Tel Aviv. An Israeli jeep was sprayed with machinegun fire and one Arab infiltrator died and one was captured in a clash near Jericho.

Across the fields near Latrun on the road to Jerusalem, uniformed Israeli schoolgirls marched, clapping and singing:

*"We shall pass, we shall pass
To straits of Tiran
In the night
And in the heat of the day"*

Men with rifles slung over their shoulders walked around the column, watchful.

Because death may strike in this besieged land anytime, anywhere.

Despite its new frontiers, convenient from the strategic point of view, Israel is losing more and more men.

Although the Arab population of the occupied territories has not been known to engage in large-scale active resistance, infiltration from Jordan continues to grow.

From June 1966 to June 5, 1967—the outbreak of the six-day war—the rate of guerrilla infiltration into Israel was one a week.

RATE MOUNTS

Now, a year later, it is two to three a day, in groups of from three to 12 men.

In the year before the victorious war, Israel had 38 military casualties of whom nine were killed and 20 civilian casualties, including two killed, in terrorist attacks.

In the past year, excluding border clashes along the Suez Canal, the Jordan River and other points of contact with Arab armies, Israel suffered 114 military casualties (22 killed) and 54 civilian casualties (10 killed).

The acts of terror by Arab infiltrators include, according to Israeli figures, 11 sabotage cases, 86 "mine incidents" and 71 shooting incidents.

In addition, other incidents caused 72 casualties among the Arab population, of whom four were killed.

OVER 1,000 SEIZED

According to the Israelis, over 1,000 infiltrators have been captured and more than 250 killed in clashes.

"They are losing more men than we," is a standard phrase—a deceiving one. Because Israel cannot afford to lose men.

Yet there is little Israel can do about it—besides being watchful and striking back.

"There is absolutely no chance of stopping terrorism entirely. It is a hopeless case," an Israeli colonel said bluntly.

"It's like traffic accidents," he continued, "you know you have to suffer from them. What comforts us is that we know that damage is comparatively limited. In fact, we can cause more damage to them than they to us."

"NO RETREAT"

"And, furthermore, for us there is no retreat. We are fighting for our lives, not for something secondary. This is our permanent Battle of Britain."

Israeli intelligence sources insist that the guerrillas and terror activity come entirely from outside. Apparently Israeli repressive measures have cooled off the enthusiasm of the Arab population for supporting the guerrillas. And the measures have been tough, ranging from arrests to the blowing up of the houses of suspects.

The Arab guerrilla apparatus, located mainly in Jordan, is far from a cohesive body. It consists of many, often competing groups, some represented by no more than a score of men.

The commandos infiltrate Israel often without precise instructions—their general mission is to commit an act of sabotage or terrorism.

This enormously complicates Israel's intelligence work. "We are extremely handicapped," one intelligence officer said. "If the Arabs were united and well organized, our intelligence work would be 100 times easier. Now we are really working in the dark."

ISRAEL CONFIDENT

Yet the Israelis are confident that the infiltrators will never amount to more than a permanent "nuisance."

"Their objective—to annihilate us—is much higher than their possibilities," one Israeli intelligence expert said.

"What helps us is a combination of Arab inefficiency, our defensive ability and also pure good luck."

But luck is not always there and the fact that a steadily growing number of Israelis pay with their lives for the country's security is becoming more and more disturbing.

"Then said I, Lord, how long?" asked a young woman, quoting from Isaiah. She lost her father in the 1948 war, one brother in the 1956 sweep across the Sinai and one in the latest war.

STOIC COUNTESSANCE

"I have no one else to lose now except my old mother," she said, her eyes dry.

On the other side of the Jordan River, nearly 1 million Arab refugees are clamoring for their homes. They have not reconciled themselves with their fate, with the Jews, with the state of Israel.

All this does not seem to bother men and women in this land, building, rebuilding, planting new fields in the wilderness and manning security roadblocks.

On the Latrun Road, the girls were singing while a long line of cars patiently waited for them to pass:

"We are as hard as marble,
Our souls are aflame."

PUBLIC AND SCHOOL LIBRARY COORDINATION

HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Public and School Library Coordination," endorsed by the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners.

The statement stresses the importance of the library in educating children for our complex world, and urges greater cooperation between public and school libraries so that both may exercise the maximum beneficial effect upon our young people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC AND SCHOOL LIBRARY COORDINATION

Continuing intellectual growth is essential to successful leadership. In this era of rapidly accelerated change and high domestic and international tensions, access to books and related materials is the key to a perspective and an understanding of complex issues. Public and school libraries working together can lead people of all ages toward a love of books and the lifelong purposeful use of libraries of all types.

The Public Library is an essential social and educational institution in a community. It represents a municipality's investment in informal and popular education, in informational services, in the cultivation of aesthetic values and in the recreational needs of its citizens. Its primary objective is to serve all people of all ages and to facilitate informal self-education by all members of the community including students. The public library requires facilities that are easily accessible, preferably in a downtown location with entrance at street level and with parking available. It is open year-round at convenient hours and maintains an informal freedom to stimulate adults, young people and children to use all its services. The public library also performs complementary and supplementary functions for the student to enrich and further develop subject materials, to provide research in depth on all subjects—curriculum or non-curriculum related.

The School Library is imperative to the quality of the total school program. A student deprived of a good school library program is a student deprived of a total curriculum. The school library is an integral part of the total school facility with its functions and activities determined by the objectives of the total school program. The school library is a laboratory where students are encouraged to develop, through library instruction, study skills related to the performance of subject assignments, and research projects as well as problem solving techniques. The school library serves the classroom teacher as an instructional materials center providing all media as well as producing materials for teaching.

Neither school nor public library alone can provide the quantity and quality of materials necessary to serve all the demands of the curriculum and the community. School and public libraries have areas of mutual concern—complementary functions particularly in rendering service to children and young people. Because both school and public libraries initially receive major financial support from the same source and because they share responsibility for book and related materials needs to students, it is important and necessary that these two types of libraries

clearly define their individual and shared functions, coordinate their programs of service to children and young people, and develop a cooperative mutual understanding of each other in order to serve the entire community more efficiently and effectively.

NEWSLETTER TO OHIO'S FIRST DISTRICT CENTERS ON GUN CONTROL, VIETNAM, AND URBAN CRISIS IN AMERICA

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, in a few days I will begin mailing my regular newsletter to the residents of Ohio's First Congressional District. The report examines the conditions in America today, both domestic and foreign, and takes a look at what I consider to be the need for a new approach to our urban problems.

I thought that some of my colleagues might be interested in the newsletter and the supplement, which touches on gun control, the omnibus crime bill, and the 10-percent surtax.

The material referred to above follows:

BOB TAFT'S WASHINGTON REPORT No. 3 TO THE FIRST DISTRICT

A TIME OF TESTING

And so, America has come to the crossroad. At home and abroad we are faced with alternative decisions that will shape the future course of this country and the entire world. It is a time for careful, deliberate consideration of our past, present, and future policy. It is a time of testing.

The situation in Viet Nam, while grave, has taken an encouraging turn. While our commitment there continues to grow, peace negotiations have shot a sliver of light through the dark clouds of desperation.

It is a time for us to hold back criticism of the war effort and to give the President as much support and encouragement as possible. History may judge harshly whether our large scale involvement in Southeast Asia was justified.

If the situation in Viet Nam has taken an encouraging turn, it is unfortunately true that the crisis in our cities continues. The tragic, senseless assassinations of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy and the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., plunged this country into sorrow and spread the uneasiness of fear through the land.

America must face up to the problems of today. While we cannot and will not tolerate civil disorder and the rioting and looting that has torn so many of our cities, we must develop positive, constructive approaches that deal with our social problems.

Congress took a step in that direction when it passed the 1968 Civil Rights Act. It must not be assumed that that is the cure-all.

This time of testing will not be easy.

URBAN AMERICA—A NEW APPROACH

America, on the threshold of the 21st Century, is engulfed in an urban crisis of unexpected proportions. Over the past four years, our nation has experienced widespread violence and destruction. We have been shocked by the harsh reality of the conditions in America's cities.

Hunger and poverty, crime and danger, disadvantage and failure have marred our progress at a time when most of the nor-

mal indicators—national output, personal income, employment levels, educational attainments, technological advancement, and life expectancy—have risen to record levels.

No simple solution

The turmoil of the inner-city has spilled over into wider metropolitan areas of this country creating slums where there were none only yesterday.

We are faced with a crisis of confidence, a crisis of leadership, a crisis of human relationships. And, it is clear that one more Federal program, one more blue-ribbon study commission, and one more after-the-riot plea for law and order are not the answer.

Commitment needed

What is needed, I believe, is a wholesale commitment not merely of government, but of the entire society to the problems of the cities. The challenge demands a new attitude and involvement of the private sector and of individuals. These approaches must assure full opportunity for development of ownership and private resources in all communities within our urban centers. We must reassign priorities and resources.

America is demanding creative leadership that will devote its energies to developing a set of realistic programs that deal with a catalogue of urban ills that could run for pages. They can be cured by the talent that has made this nation as wealthy and powerful as it is today.

Along with other members of Congress, I shall continue to devote my energies to the problems of the cities, not in handouts but in opportunity and hope.

AIR SAFETY, FACT AND FICTION

In February, Congressman Don Clancy and I sponsored the 1968 Cincinnati Air Safety Conference in an attempt to familiarize the general public and their elected officials with some of the problems and advances in air safety.

The dozen air safety experts agreed that a large expenditure would be necessary to keep up with the technological improvements of aircraft.

Just recently, the Federal Aviation Administration awarded a \$405,500 grant to the Greater Cincinnati Airport to finance construction, marking and lighting of taxiways. The airport will also have three I.L.S. equipped runways. The funds come under the Federal-aid Airport Program.

A FAMILIAR FIRST DISTRICT SIGHT

Since March, 1967, we've been holding a series of Neighborhood meetings throughout the District to give you an opportunity to meet with your Representative and to discuss any suggestions, problems, or criticisms you might have.

So far, over 5,000 of you have attended the meetings. I've found them to be an invaluable source of information regarding your positions on the various issues that have faced and will face the 90th Congress. In addition, I believe that we have been able to help some of you who have had various difficulties in dealing with the complexities of the Federal government.

In the coming months we will continue the series of meetings, and should have one in your neighborhood soon. I welcome your comments regarding the meetings.

"SPOTLIGHT ON HAMILTON COUNTY"

Area colleges win Federal grants

A number of Cincinnati area Colleges and Universities have been awarded Federal grants in recent months. The funds, primarily from the Office of Education, include support for college work-study programs, assistance to high school science teachers interested in continuing their education, and a \$65,000 grant to the University of Cincinnati to encourage high school and college dropouts to finish their studies.

HUD aids housing project

In March, the Department of Housing and Urban Development approved a \$3-million grant to the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority for use in upgrading low rent housing projects in the area.

"Air Bus" engine contract to GE

United and American Airlines have stipulated use of General Electric's CF-36 turbofan engine to power their McDonnell-Douglas DC-10 "air bus." The multi-million dollar contracts mean thousands of new jobs in U.S., many at General Electric's Evendale plant.

Hospital research

Cincinnati hospitals benefited from several Federal grants during recent months. The

funds, in support of research projects, included an \$87,574 award from the Public Health Service to Children's Hospital, and a \$25,734 grant from PHS to Jewish Hospital for general research.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Fast moving events on the domestic and international scene somewhat outdated the Questionnaire I mailed to every First District resident last March. The questions on the Viet Nam War and the Travel Tax were especially affected by recent events. Nevertheless, I believe the results are significant, and offer a special thanks to all who took the time to reply. As in the past I have indicated my preferences following the percentages for the District.

| Questions | Yes (percent) | No (percent) | My preferences at that time |
|---|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Do you approve of the Johnson administration's handling of the Vietnam war? | 12 | 88 | No. |
| 2. Do you favor military withdrawal by the United States from South Vietnam even without reasonable assurance that the Vietnamese people will have a free choice of government? | 31 | 69 | No. |
| 3. Do you approve of the United States handling of the seizure of the U.S.S. "Pueblo" by North Korea? | 18 | 82 | No. |
| 4. Should the draft laws be changed to require application of national standards for induction into the Armed Forces? | 80 | 20 | Yes. |
| 5. Should the Nation be working to eliminate a compulsory draft? | 46 | 54 | Yes. |
| 6. Do you feel the administration's proposed income tax increase is justified? | 30 | 70 | No. |
| 7. Do you support the administration's proposed tax on foreign travel? | 42 | 58 | No. |
| 8. Should the administration be doing more to combat inflation? | 94 | 6 | Yes. |
| 9. Should Federal Government spending be cut? | 90 | 10 | Yes. |
| 10. Do you feel that air pollution is a serious problem in the greater Cincinnati area? | 74 | 26 | Yes. |
| 11. Do you believe air safety procedures at the Nation's airports, including Greater Cincinnati Airport, are adequate? | 35 | 65 | No. |
| 12. Do you feel government at all levels must take additional steps to enforce law and order? | 92 | 8 | Yes. |
| 13. Do you favor offering government incentives to employers to hire and train unskilled workers? | 54 | 46 | Yes. |

WRITING YOUR CONGRESSMAN?

A number of you have asked me whether it is better to write, call, or drop by my Office when you have questions or need help on particular matters. While we are always happy to see you or to hear from you, letters have proved to be one of the most efficient methods of communicating with your Congressman. The following suggestions might be helpful:

(1) A letter is better than a phone call. It constitutes a written record for future reference.

(2) Make your letter brief. If possible, it should be confined to one page. Members of Congress receive an average of more than 100 letters every working day, and, with Committee meetings scheduled at 10:00 A.M., and the House session at noon, we have less than two hours a day for Office work.

(3) Confine comments to one subject for each letter. This exclusive treatment underscores importance writer attaches to the subject and demands a responsive and definitive reply.

(4) Personal letters better than form letters or signature on a petition. Many persons sign a petition without reading it just to avoid offending the carrier. Form letters are readily recognizable as such and register nothing more than the sentiments of the person who first prepared the form.

Most important of all, don't hesitate to write. I'm interested in hearing from you, whether it's a suggestion, complaint, or simple comment. As your elected Representative, I want to have your ideas on all of the issues that will face the Congress.

BOB TAFT'S WASHINGTON REPORT No. 3 SUPPLEMENT TO THE FIRST DISTRICT

Within the last few weeks three major issues have captured the attention of most Americans and have triggered more mail on Capitol Hill than most veteran legislators have seen in many years. I thought it was very important, therefore, to give you my thinking in those areas, and have included

this supplement along with my regular newsletter.

GUN CONTROL

Dramatized so unfortunately as it has been by the brutal assassinations of President Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, no issue has aroused more interest and feeling during this session of Congress than gun control legislation.

As I have told and written many of you before, my position on this subject is that basic regulation and registration can best be handled by state and local government. The chief reason for choice of supervision at that level is that conditions vary widely with respect to the use of and need for firearms in different parts of the country. In addition, a Federal registration law might create another "prohibition" type breakdown of law and order.

But, to make state and local regulation effective, strong Federal legislation—licensing dealers, controlling interstate and international sales and shipments, eliminating mail order sales for all firearms, not merely handguns—is needed.

I have, therefore, supported the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Bill on handguns and will do all I can in this Congress to support its extension to other firearms.

OMNIBUS CRIME BILL

The President has finally signed the Omnibus Crime Bill. Despite numerous efforts to weaken it, the measure is a step in the right direction, and I supported it as did almost all in Congress.

The bill will help: in proper police training; root out organized crime through court approved and limited wiretapping; while an imperfect attempt, clarify or change recent Supreme Court pronouncements on confessions, and evidentiary rules.

I believe it was a step forward in assisting with state hand gun legislation, as discussed above.

All in all, the Crime Bill won't, itself, have any major impact on our terrible and growing

crime problem, but it should help somewhat. I was happy to support it.

TEN PERCENT SURTAX

On June 20, 1968, I voted against the Conference Report on the Tax Bill because I believed that there were better alternatives available to the Congress by which inflation might be attacked and fiscal responsibility restored. Those alternatives should have been adopted, in part, by cutting appropriations by \$6 to \$8 billion in programs such as: space; public works; military forces in Europe; farm subsidies; cutting number of Federal employees in most Federal programs.

If, after accomplishing this, it appeared that dangerous inflationary forces were still at work, Congress could, with justification and reason, have turned to a tax measure such as the surtax or rate revisions.

There were many objections to the tax bill, as passed. These included: Spending limitation in the bill represents an abdication to the President of Congress' responsibility for funding or refusing to fund various Federal programs; \$6 billion cuts called for could be made in area of health, education, or welfare because there were no guarantees that this would not be done; combined effect of tax surcharge and spending limitation, if observed, could trigger an economic recession in the Nation; adoption of tax bill, at this time, does not mean adjustment in spending or programs by either the Administration or the Congress from its deficit spending approaches and attitudes. It is merely a postponement of a decision that must ultimately be made if the country is not to face bankruptcy.

BETTS ANNOUNCES QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Eighth Congressional District and newly added Erie and Huron Counties have again responded enthusiastically to my annual legislative questionnaire. This means of voicing an opinion on issues facing Congress is valuable to me as I study proposals coming before the House and gives the citizen a chance to record his or her judgment on these issues. The questionnaire was mailed to each household in the district with more than 31,000 persons returning them to me.

Several hundred people wrote separate letters giving additional comments on national issues. I have personally responded to each letter and card. Many people wrote approvingly of my Washington report in which I outlined some of my views on the war in Vietnam, crime and civil disorder and the problems of inflation and government spending. Overall, this questionnaire was a constructive experience which I hope to continue in the future.

The Vietnam war has not changed greatly as of this writing despite preliminary peace talks underway in Paris. Recently, the highest weekly total of American men killed in battle was recorded—while the United States and North Vietnam delegations were conferring on possible cessation of bombing and reduction of hostilities. In 1967 I used the term "anxiety" to describe the overriding attitudes of those who answered my ques-

tionnaire. Today, I would say anxiety has turned to frustration at the inconclusiveness of our fighting in Vietnam. People are deeply puzzled and perplexed that the strongest country in the world apparently cannot achieve meaningful gains in the war. The impression that Vietnam is at a stalemate militarily—as well as in terms of political stability—has resulted in a growing belief that negotiations to withdraw are the best way out of a bad war at a bad time in a bad place.

The high degree of resentment against countries trading and aiding North Vietnam reflects the essential belief that the United States must support fully our men in Vietnam. I share this view, especially as it could be implemented by the State Department's withholding foreign aid to countries engaging in these practices. Vietnam should be considered a responsibility of the entire free world against continuing efforts by communism to dominate more lands and peoples. It is disappointing that the United States has so few friends when the chips are down.

The poll results showed 73 percent of those answering oppose a 10-percent tax increase and that 71 percent favor a cut in Federal spending. I had hoped the House would consider separate legislation for a tax increase and reducing non-defense spending. Regrettably the issues were joined in a bill the passage of which was critical to the Nation's financial stability. Let me refer to my statement of June 20, the day the bill to impose the surtax and spending cuts was debated and passed in the House:

The issue before the House of Representatives and, indeed, before the American people today is much more than the question of whether or not to increase taxes and reduce expenditures. The fiscal affairs of our Nation are in such a wanton and perilous state that if immediate responsible action is not taken to restore some semblance of fiscal discipline we will be courting the gravest danger for integrity of the dollar and subjecting our citizens to ruinous inflation.

The danger is real and is not to be denied. The ruinous course of endless and mounting deficits urged upon us by the spenders must be reversed. We must have the ears to hear and the eyes to see the facts as they exist regardless of how painful or against our inclinations their recognition might be. We must have the will and courage to correct the consequences of the fiscal folly that has been foisted on the American people by an Administration that has misrepresented its extravagant actions as being responsible and in the National interest.

In a sense, the ordeal of the decision today is a vindication of those of us who over the years have consistently advocated restraint and responsibility in the management of our fiscal affairs. Yet, I find no personal gratification in being sustained in my long-standing conviction that the Administration's policies of the past several years were overcommitting and overextending our National capacity. I claim no personal political justification in the fact that the Administration's spending policies which I opposed have resulted in major miscalculation and grievous mismanagement in the handling of our fiscal affairs. I seek no support from the fact that the Administration's frequent resort to piecemeal short-term fiscal expedients and gimmickry which I opposed has not succeeded. Instead, I am determined that the seriousness of the present situation shall not be overlooked today nor forgotten in the future.

Therefore, I reluctantly support the temporary tax increase that would be provided by the Conference Agreement on H.R. 15414 and wholeheartedly endorse the long overdue and urgently needed spending restraint that it would provide.

Wage and price controls are highly undesirable methods of bringing stability and controlling inflation. They are hard to enforce equitably and generally take a long time to give even partial relief. While costs and prices in business and industry continue to spiral upward and have their inflationary effect, I believe the public sector must take the leadership in putting its fiscal house in order. The profligate spending of the Johnson Administration is no model for private enterprise and unions.

I think the strong endorsements by people all over the country for congressional action to restrain and temper some recent Supreme Court decisions, if not the Court itself, is having its effect. The anticrime bill recently passed by Congress and signed by the President contained some important provisions tempering Supreme Court decisions. I have supported that legislation.

Civil disturbances, demonstrations and rioting have grown to such scope and frequency that many communities simply cannot cope with them without additional equipment, training, manpower or statutory authority. As a former Hancock County prosecutor, I see no inconsistency in providing training funds, surplus equipment and assistance to State attorneys general for better communication and criminal identification operations. Also, organized crime and professional agitators and troublemakers who travel from State to State to plot against law and order should be subject to Federal legislation.

These are critical times and perplexing ones. We live in relative affluence but have a Poor People's March here in Washington; provide young people with a world of opportunity and a few of them go wild and close universities; have given \$120 billion to 100 countries since World War II and only a score or so will stop aiding our enemies; and our teenagers have about all they could want but commit 60 percent of all auto thefts. Our Nation is strong enough to overcome such challenges. We have before and I am confident we shall again. If some of our tribulations magnified by television, seem insoluble it may be that we have moved so rapidly into the mid-20th century that we have left behind some tried and true ways of living.

Mr. Speaker, I place the complete results of the 1968 Eighth Congressional District legislative questionnaire at this point in the RECORD:

EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

| In Vietnam, which do you recommend: | | Percent |
|--|-------|---------|
| Continue present course of limited war | ----- | 2 |
| Negotiate to withdraw | ----- | 48 |
| Apply whatever military pressure necessary for victory | ----- | 49 |
| Undecided | ----- | 1 |

(NOTE.—Some people checked more than one alternative.)

Should the United States continue to trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 12 |
| No ----- | 83 |
| Undecided ----- | 5 |

Do you support the President's proposed 10% surtax on income taxes?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 23 |
| No ----- | 73 |
| Undecided ----- | 4 |

Do you believe that Federal spending on domestic programs should be reduced?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 71 |
| No ----- | 26 |
| Undecided ----- | 3 |

Do you think Congress needs to curb the power of the Supreme Court?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 70 |
| No ----- | 25 |
| Undecided ----- | 5 |

Do you think President Johnson should impose compulsory wage and price controls?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 34 |
| No ----- | 60 |
| Undecided ----- | 6 |

Would you vote for increased funds to fight the "War on Poverty?"

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 25 |
| No ----- | 70 |
| Undecided ----- | 5 |

Do you think we need any additional Federal legislation to cope with riots, demonstrations that go beyond the peaceful state, or other civil disturbances?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 69 |
| No ----- | 25 |
| Undecided ----- | 6 |

Would you support President Johnson's plan to spend \$2.3 billion to construct and rebuild 2.3 million housing units in the next 5 years?

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 26 |
| No ----- | 64 |
| Undecided ----- | 10 |

What three national issues are most important to you? (Most frequently listed.)

1. War in Vietnam.
2. Crime in our streets.
3. Civil disobedience and disorder.
4. Return of Pueblo.
5. Inflation.

HEALTH HAZARDS OF ATOMIC ENERGY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 or 4 years, much has been said and written about the health hazards of smoking. As a physician, I have been keenly aware of the body ills that may result from smoking and other health hazards for a number of years.

However, not too much has been said or written about the health hazards of atomic energy. For a couple of hours on May 17, the editor of the *Madisonville Messenger*, of Madisonville, Ky., interviewed a man, who is called a human dynamo, who has some facts, figures, and opinions which he feels should convince

any layman that Atomic Energy poses real health hazards to present and future generations. This man is Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, now in his sixth year as president of the United Mine Workers of America and his second term as Chairman of the National Coal Policy Conference.

Believing that my colleagues would find Mr. Boyle's views on this subject of much interest, I insert the reprint of the above-mentioned interview in the *Record* at this point:

HE DOESN'T LIKE IT: UMWA'S PRESIDENT IS NO FAN OF ATOMIC ENERGY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is a reprint of the May 18 Page 1 story carried by the *Madisonville Messenger*, the afternoon newspaper of Madisonville, Ky., where UMWA District 23 headquarters is located. The lively West Kentucky newspaper's editor, Edgar Arnold, Jr. spent a couple of hours interviewing UMWA International President W. A. Boyle in the District 23 office on May 17. Arnold is also president of the publishing company which publishes the newspaper, editor of the editorial page and we would say, on the basis of this story, also the star reporter.)

(By Edgar Arnold, Jr.)

Say "atomic energy" to W. A. (Tony) Boyle and you touch off a chain reaction of facts, figures and opinions that ought to convince any layman that there is something to Boyle's claims that:

"They are experimenting with the life, health and well-being of this generation and future generations, and they ought to be stopped—that's all there is to it!"

Boyle is a human dynamo now in his sixth year as President of the *United Mine Workers of America* and his second term as Chairman of the *National Coal Policy Conference*. He and George J. Titler, vice president; and John Owens, secretary-treasurer of the *International Union*, arrived in Madisonville Friday on an official visit to *UMW District 23*.

Their visits to the various districts began about a year ago, as a matter of policy, in order for the top union officials to "get better acquainted with members and officials, to view our mutual problems first-hand, to improve communication."

Boyle and the others were to speak to a mass meeting of *UMW* members in *Madisonville High School* gymnasium this afternoon, and hundreds of miners in the Western Kentucky coal field were expected to attend.

The *UMW* president is quick to tell an interviewer that the basic principles of the *United Mine Workers of America*, today and since its founding in 1890, are the "safety and well-being of coal miners." He notes that some of his critics, since he began a concerted attack on the dangers of atomic energy a few years ago, have charged that he is neglecting miners' problems. "This is just a smoke-screen," says Boyle. "Everybody living in the United States—including coal miners—ought to be concerned about atomic dangers."

His original concern about atomic energy, Boyle says, was based mainly on its "unfair competition" with the coal industry. "But when I began to learn about all the dangers, it became a bigger thing," he says.

"To begin with, the atomic-energy industry was set up with government funds—taxpayer's money—to compete with a free, modern industry that is serving the public well and supplying good jobs for a lot of men. This ought to be enough to make states like Kentucky—where coal is so important—rise up in protest at the unfair competition that has cost thousands of miners their jobs.

"But in areas like Appalachia, what you get is slick little politicians—in an election year—flying into places like the mountains of Kentucky on whirlwind visits and then

going back East to issue statements about the 'pitiful' things they saw.

"What needs to be done to help the poor, and the working man," says Boyle, "is for the Federal government to put an end to expensive trips to the moon and to the further waste of taxpayers' money on atomic experiments and spend this money on jobs and welfare programs."

Boyle said he personally proposed to President Johnson that any spending cuts tied to a proposed tax increase ought to first come from curbing the vast spending on the space program. "We have no quarrel with the nation's needs for atomic weapons or military rockets," says Boyle, "we don't want to interfere with the national defense."

But experiments with atomic energy for production of electric power or for de-salting water are a different matter, according to the *UMW* president.

He can give numerous examples of what he calls: "The Atomic Energy Commission spending untold millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to experiment with a dangerous, hazardous, poisonous fuel that they cannot seem to get to work properly."

"Even when and if they get it to work, there is no answer to the waste problem," says Boyle. "Atomic plants are polluting our rivers and those underground test blasts are dangerous—nobody knows how far the poisonous radiation may seep through fractures in the ground hundreds of feet below the surface. How does the public know about any atomic dangers when the AEC is the promoter, the judge and the only authority on it? Congress gave the AEC too much power, and Congress ought to take it back."

A "prime example" of both the waste of tax money and the dangers inherent in atomic power plants, says Boyle, is the *Fermi* plant near Detroit. "This power plant was built at a cost of \$300,000,000—mostly Federal funds—as a 'dream' power plant. Two years ago, they touched off a chain reaction which came dangerously close to destroying the entire city of Detroit. They somehow managed to get in under control but now, two years later, they still don't know what happened and the plant is still idle."

Turning to another favorite topic, Boyle talks with obvious pride about the *National Coal Policy Conference*—a cooperative organization comprising the *UMW*, the coal industry, the railroads, the electric power industry and major suppliers of the coal industry.

The idea of the *NCP* was first offered by John L. Lewis, long-time *UMW* president, in 1958, as a means for these related interests to work together on mutual problems—like competition with other fuels, air and water pollution and land reclamation. Boyle was recently reelected chairman of the *NCP*.

Turning back to his role of *UMW* chieftain, Boyle says a major issue upon which the union is continuing to fight is the need to get "complete elimination of the dust problem in the mines. This can be solved and it ought to be solved," said Boyle.

ACCOMPLICES

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the June 11 issue of the *Daily Signal*, published in Huntington Park, Calif., contains a letter by Mr. Wilbur P. Smith, which I believe is worthy of the attention of my colleagues. My constituent expresses the reaction of the reasonable men to the miasma of violent proclama-

tions fed to the American people in the media reporting political discussion in this country. Perhaps it is time to listen to the voices of reason and provide a change in the daily fare of hatred and hyperbole to stave off a justifiable national regurgitation.

Mr. Smith's letter to the editor follows:

EDITOR'S MAIL BOX: ACCOMPLICES

The Editor.

Sir: An assassin with a cheap gun has killed a United States Senator and our national impulse is to tear him to pieces. Congress rushes to pass a long overdue anti-gun law. There is a national hysteria to "do something." I wonder when we will try getting at some other accomplices of the assassin. When will we strike at the root of the "sickness" in our country that has stunned the conscience of our people? Where do we start looking for other culprits who, in a sense, put the gun into the hand of the assassin and pointed out the victim? How and when do we answer Markham's questions:

"Whose was the hand that slanted back that brow?"

"Whose breath blew out the light within that mind?"

Perhaps we haven't too far to look if we really wish to see. Maybe just because the solution is so simple it has eluded us. Let me point a finger:

First: There is the TV commentator whose daily fare to listeners is filled with subtle and insidious forms of hate. There is the "A" student in college journalism turned columnist who assumes the right to inform us how the world should be run, what we must think, and whom we must hate. There are the so-called ministers of God who profane His name by spouting hysteria, pitting race against race, and religion against religion. There is the elected official (and the not-elected) who would brand everyone subversive who does not hate as he hates. There are Johnny-Come-Latelys who tell us how to run the nation, who should be strung up, and who to get the assassin's bullets. And there are all those persons at home and abroad who counsel us to destruction by urging us to crime, riot, revolution, and murder.

It seems to me that strident voices must be muffled. They are as dangerous to life and liberty as the man carrying a loaded gun in a public place. And they should be prosecuted accordingly! Everyone should be as careful with words as with money, for each is a token of value. If we must ban weapons let us also control those voices who urge us to hate and national disunity.

There is room in our nation for criticism and heated debate. There is no room for the subtle incitement to hatred and violence. For fear and hate seduce inflamed minds into deeds for goals they do not understand.

It is past time America looked backward with shame at the deaths of so many of our fine minds and best people at the hands of assassins. We should look with horror upon those whose voices urged an assassin to point a weapon and pull the trigger. Let us continue to sorrow for Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the many others like them who met untimely deaths through hate-induced violence. We must halt this agony. If we do not, or cannot, we have little just right to extoll our nation's greatness.

It is true that in the long run truth wins. It is also true, as someone observed, that in the long run we are all dead. We don't have too much time left.

WILBUR P. SMITH.

POOR REVOLUTION OUTLINED

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, now that Insurrection City is no longer in business and the Director of Parks can start about the business of cleaning up the litter, filth, and debris left by the campers, and, of course, this will be at the expense of the taxpayers—and all is hopefully over and everyone has accomplished his or her purpose to the point that Preacher Abernathy is in jail where he wanted to be—the question that keeps nagging me is this: Did the American people ever really realize what was behind it all? A very interesting and enlightening article was the Allen-Scott Report that was printed June 5, 1968. I think it should be read by everyone. It is as follows:

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: POOR REVOLUTION OUTLINED

WASHINGTON.—Leaders of the "Poor People's" campaign are revealing goals to liberal members of Congress that are much more revolutionary than those highlighted in their public statements.

During a private meeting arranged by Sen. Charles Percy [R., Ill.], the Rev. James Bevel, a member of the campaign's inner circle, visibly shook a number of the legislators by citing five unpublished objectives:

To redistribute the wealth of the United States and turn the means of production over to the people.

To eliminate all armaments. The people, Bevel says, can only get rid of their fears if the military will put down their guns and missiles. All local and state police must be "reoriented."

To eliminate all violence in the world, defined by Bevel as all disciplinary relationships. Example: "We do not believe in a parent making a child conform to a certain norm."

To rid the world of all the "Fascists and jitterbug Fascists." The former are conservative members of Congress and the Press. The latter are liberals who fail to join or support the "Poor People's" campaign.

INTRODUCED BY PERCY

Appearing in coveralls and with a Castro-type beard, Bevel lectured the G.O.P. group for 1½ hours after Sen. Percy had introduced him and indorsed the "Poor People's" campaign.

"The whole struggle of this Poor People's campaign is economic class warfare," Bevel bluntly stated. "There must be a complete redistribution of wealth in this country one way or another."

When one of the lawmakers questioned Bevel about the purpose of the "Poor People's" campaign, Bevel described it as "a great human theatrical drama being enacted to educate the people of the United States and the world."

"In this great dramatic play," he stated, "there are senators, congressman, police, apathetic citizens, and the poor people. All have their roles to play."

PREDICTS VIOLENT SCENES

In a forecast of things to come, Bevel warned:

"Various scenes of this great play will be violent. But in the end all will be peaceful because fear and hate will have been eliminated from the United States and the world."

Questioned about his loyalty, the militant black power advocate replied:

"I feel no responsibility to a nation-state. I represent conscious energy, which is a universal phenomenon. As a result, I don't get too excited when I see a rag on a stick called a flag."

In a discussion of G.O.P. political leaders he supports, Bevel described Mayor John Lindsay of New York as "probably the most intelligent man in the country today." Quizzed about this Republican host, Bevel replied:

"I indorsed Sen. Percy in Illinois because he was running against an old man [Sen. Paul Douglas] and I don't have much confidence in old men."

When Bevel finished, there was silence.

BARGE LINES PUSH JOINT RATE PLEA

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been the longstanding policy of Congress to encourage in the public interest improved coordination of service among truck, water, and rail lines. The public is best served when voluntary cooperation exists among the various modes. It is with pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues an article in the New York Times of June 9 describing new efforts to develop improved cooperation between barge and rail carriers.

I insert this article in the RECORD:

BARGE LINES PUSH JOINT RATE PLEA—INITIATE A NEW APPROACH IN COURTSHIP OF RAILROADS

The love-hate relationship between those two arch rivals for hauling bulk cargoes, the barge lines and the railroads, goes back well over a century to the days when the iron horse challenged the mules that trod the towpaths of the Erie Canal.

The trains have since maintained their superiority in speed, the barges their tempting advantage in lower costs.

The water carriers have for many years courted the cooperation of the railroads in setting joint water-rail rates, pointing to the better deal this would mean for shippers. Every branch of the Federal Government has looked with favor on such arrangements: the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Congress and the new Department of Transportation, which favors cooperation among the categories of carriers.

EXAMPLES OF SAVINGS

The Water Transport Association has now begun a new approach. Instead of basing its case for joint rates on general principles, it has started offering examples of freight savings that could bring new profits to railroads as well as barge companies.

Floyd H. Blaske, chairman of American Commercial Lines, first sounded this note on behalf of his fellow rivermen at a recent speech in Louisville.

The Texas oil industry annually gets more than 20,000 tons of steel pipe from Pittsburgh he said, costing \$30.80 a ton to move all the way by rail to a central storage point such as Odessa, Tex. He suggested a potential saving of \$6.18 a ton by bringing it down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers by barge as far as Memphis and then completing the journey by rail.

The saving, he said would be \$123,000 a year on that volume of traffic.

SALT FROM LOUISIANA

Similarly, he said the cost of moving salt from Louisiana to Wisconsin could be cut \$2.20 a ton on an annual volume of 90,000 tons, or \$198,000, if railroads and barge lines could get together on "willing partner" rates.

He underlined that these figures of savings were not necessary entirely for the benefit of the shippers, hinting that "It may well be, on some of these movements, that the right economic decision is to share these savings between the shipper and the connecting railroad."

Further examples were offered in a speech in Lincoln, Neb., by Charles E. Walker, president of the Union Barge Line Corporation. Mr. Walker cited the Water Transport Association's case studies involving synthetic rubber and skelp, a steel plate used in making pipe.

SEES 17-PERCENT SAVING

The synthetic rubber moves in a volume of about 220,000 tons a year, he said, at a typical all-rail rate of \$22 a ton from Baton Rouge, La., to New Haven, Conn.

If barges took it up the Mississippi and Ohio to Leetsdale near Pittsburgh, he said, the combined barge-rail rate could be \$18.33 a ton, for a 17 per cent saving.

This could add up to approximately \$275,000 a year if one-third of the tonnage took this route, he said.

In the other direction, he said, more than 20,000 tons of skelp moves annually by rail from Pittsburgh to Lone Star, Tex., at \$14.01 a ton. Shipping it to Vicksburg, Miss., by barge and then to Lone Star by rail would give a joint rate of \$11.88 a ton, he said, for a 15 per cent saving and an annual saving of about \$42,600.

Mr. Walker asked, "Why are these two movements not in the interests of the railroads and the shippers?" He invited a "meaningful dialogue" on the subject.

Floyd A. Mechling, executive vice president of A. L. Mechling Barge Lines, struck a similar note last month in the Advanced Transportation Management Program at Northwestern University's Transportation Center.

Calling for a "true partnership" of rail and waterway carriers similar to cooperation among railroads, he said:

"Significantly improved profits for both modes would follow."

The idea has already produced results for Mr. Mechling's own line, in a new low rate on corn for export that will move from points in Iowa to Gulf ports under a joint plan with the Chicago & North Western Railway. The railroad will move the corn to Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis for transfer to a barge.

PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS HAVE BEEN MORE SUCCESSFUL THAN GOVERNMENT

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there are dramatic examples from time to time which show how individual Americans and private organizations are more successful than Government programs. All too often the private sector of our economy is not given adequate credit for the initiative it uses in doing quietly and effectively what might take years and vast amounts of money on the part of the Federal Government.

In the past I have spoken of the contribution made by the Society of Friends, the Quakers. Now Maxwell N. Rabb, president of the American Refugee Committee, as an individual and with the committee, managed to do what many in

the Government were unable to do, the freeing of Americans out of the jails of East Berlin. This shows that an American father, his wife, and their son can probably do much more than organized expensive Government programs. I am delighted that after many months of discreet silence the New York Times and the Associated Press in the Washington Post have told the story of how the secretary of the Cabinet and associate counsel to President Eisenhower managed to free these American citizens.

The American Refugee Committee, a privately supported organization and its voluntary officers have a role to play in creating better human relations. I hope that private individuals and groups will derive some encouragement from the courage, imagination, and integrity shown by the Honorable Maxwell Rabb.

Below, follows the text of the articles: [From the Washington Post, June 13, 1968]

MAX RABB SHOWS NEGOTIATING SKILL WITH REDS

(By Henrietta Leith)

NEW YORK, June 12.—The delicate art of negotiating, which has just brought a young Columbia University instructor out of an East German prison with no deal but "good will," is an old skill for New York attorney Maxwell Milton Rabb.

Rabb, 57, had negotiated the release of six other Americans from jails behind the Iron Curtain before his latest feat—securing the return to West Berlin of art historian Ronald Widenhoeft, 31.

MATTER OF PRIDE

Rabb is especially proud of securing the release of Widenhoeft, who had not even been tried on his charge of taking pictures of restricted areas.

He won't give details except to say that the men he dealt with were of Cabinet rank and that he used the same technique each time, and paid all his own expenses. "I'm not CIA, with a secret account," he quips.

He adds that he never gave the East Germans any money as ransom for the Americans.

"They won't take it from us," he said. They take it from West Germany, but they don't want to lose face with us.

"What I did is old as the hills—the personal private relationship where you break down the barriers. You have to use two styles—never let your country down but always be frank and honest. Instead of fighting over each word for two months, you trust each other."

A Bostonian and Harvard man, Rabb started his public career in 1937 as an assistant to Henry Cabot Lodge, who was then in the Senate.

He stayed with Lodge, except for Navy service during World War II, until 1951, and worked hard in the campaign to draft Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to run for the presidency. His reward was a job as assistant to Eisenhower's principal assistant, Sherman Adams, and in 1953 he became associate counsel to the President, with civil rights, immigration and labor as his special responsibilities.

Rabb also served Eisenhower as secretary to the Cabinet. Later he moved to the United Nations, where his old friend Lodge was chief U.S. delegate and ambassador.

But it was as a businessman's lawyer that he got involved in the delicate task of negotiating the release of prisoners.

Rabb had a manufacturing client who suspected that his competitors in England, France and West Germany were doing business with East Germany, and were going to show their products at the Leipzig Fair.

WON PLACE FOR CLIENT

Rabb went to Leipzig and discovered that the major exhibits of products there were those of the U.S.S.R., West Germany, Czechoslovakia, England and France, in that order.

Rabb reported this fact to the State Department, and his client got the previously refused permission to exhibit at the fair.

Some time later, the State Department came to him. All normal diplomatic approaches had been exhausted in the effort to free John Van Altena, 21, of Wisconsin who had served 17 months of an eight-year prison term for trying to help East Germans get out of their country.

"The State Department remembered I'd been there," says Rabb, "and had met people. To the credit of the State Department, they don't like to see Americans rot in foreign jails. Would I take it on? I said 'Fine.'"

Rabb carried out his mission in March, 1966, "to the surprise of the State Department and most of all to the surprise of John Van Altena."

Almost a year later, Rabb secured the release of four more Americans from East Germany—Mary Ellen Battle of Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Frederick Matthews of Pennsylvania; Moses Herrin of Akron, Ohio, and William Lovett of San Francisco.

Lovett had been held on charges growing out of an auto accident. The other three were accused of helping East Germans escape.

Rabb's sixth rescue last May 11 was the release of Peter T. Feinauer, 27, of Providence, R.I., another Columbia instructor who was convicted of spying with a camera.

[From the New York Times, June 16, 1968] LAWYER RELATES EAST GERMAN TIE—A NEW YORKER HELPED FREE SEVEN U.S. PRISONERS

(By Henry Raymond)

At the crossing point between East and West Berlin on Friedrichstrasse, where West Berlin tour buses pull up for a glimpse into the East, an odd scene took place one recent afternoon.

A bearded young man, looking somewhat bewildered, escorted by a stocky Wall Street lawyer and trailed by two East German security officials, was greeted on the Western side by a United States embassy aide.

The young man was Ronald V. Widenhoeft, 30 years old, a Columbia University art history instructor who 20 minutes earlier was released from an East German prison where he spent nine months awaiting trial on espionage charges. His rescuer was Maxwell M. Rabb, a lawyer and president of the United States Committee for Refugees, a private organization at 20 West 40th Street New York.

The quiet crossing at 2:21 P.M. on June 3 ended an unusual three-year campaign to free seven American prisoners in East Germany. Because Washington does not recognize East Germany, the effort was carried out through quiet and informal collaboration between American private citizens and the two governments.

DETAILS ARE RELATED

Mr. Rabb and others involved in the effort related last week the details of the negotiations, indicating the skill, patience and tactful but dogged determination required.

In contrast to past exchanges of spies with the Soviet Union and the ransom payments for Cuban exiles seized by the Havana regime during the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961, no quid pro quo was involved.

The campaign was set in motion after the State Department had made a series of futile approaches to the East German Government for the release of a young American, John Van Altena, 22 years old, of Milton Junction, Wis., who had been sentenced to eight years, in January, 1965, for helping East Germans flee to West Berlin.

The East Germans made plain that they

would negotiate with Washington only if they obtained diplomatic recognition, a condition unacceptable to the United States, which is still officially committed to the reunification of Germany on the basis of free, democratic elections.

The State Department began to search for other channels to obtain the release of Mr. Van Altena. According to Mr. Rabb, his involvement came almost by accident.

The Boston-born lawyer had been asked by several clients to visit the 1965 Leipzig Trade Fair to determine whether an American boycott of the fair was in the national interest. There he developed close personal relations with a number of East German trade officials who had expressed interest in a normalization of relations.

ENLISTED BY U.S. OFFICIALS

When he subsequently went to Washington to tell the State Department that other Western nations were using the fair to sell machinery and other goods to the detriment of American industry, American officials asked whether he could use his connections in East Germany to intercede on behalf of the young American prisoner. Mr. Rabb agreed to try, and returned to Leipzig accompanied by his wife, Ruth.

The decision to take along his wife reflected Mr. Rabb's conviction that personal relationships counted more in international talks than textbooks on diplomacy might be willing to admit. Two years later he repeated the personal touch by enlisting the help of his son Bruce, a 26-year-old lawyer who has joined his father in the Wall Street law firm of Strook & Strook & Lavan, in the negotiations that led to the release of Mr. Wiedenhoef.

"The fact that I returned with Ruth had a startling effect," he recalled during an interview. "It seemed to suggest to the East Germans that we were vaulting the diplomatic wall and were interested in them as human beings. This immediately created a more relaxed and friendly atmosphere for the talks that were to follow."

Mr. Rabb, an affable man of 57 with the ready smile of a practical politician, is a former Presidential assistant and secretary to the Cabinet under the Eisenhower Administration and has held a number of international appointments.

From the outset, the lawyer made it clear that he was not in a position to offer any commitment and that the negotiations had to be based on mutual good faith. He suggested that East German willingness to release American prisoners would help reduce cold war tensions and perhaps ease the way to improved trade relations with the United States.

"They quickly became aware that the release of Mr. Van Altena and the six other prisoners that were to follow amounted to a demonstration of a desire to normalize relations," Mr. Rabb said.

"I believe that it is significant that since the first prisoner was freed more than two years ago there has been a reduction of incidents with the United States military and a palpable increase in trade relations, entirely to our advantage."

The new East German extension of transit-visa and road-toll requirements to West Germans are not viewed as a threat to the American military presence in West Berlin.

The lawyer said the United States had exported oranges, coal, textiles and some machinery totaling \$10-million. He characterized the sales as "clearly helping our balance-of-payments problem."

After the initial meetings in Leipzig, Mr. Rabb made four unpublished trips to Berlin where he conferred with a Deputy Premier and members of the state police before he obtained the release of Mr. Van Altena. He said he could not disclose the names of the officials.

TWO BERLIN LAWYERS

His command post was a West Berlin hotel. Since there is no direct telephone communication between East and West Berlin, the arrangements were worked out by two lawyers, Jürgen Stange of West Berlin and Wolfgang Vogel of East Berlin. Mr. Vogel had participated in the trade of Francis Gary Powers, the American U-2 pilot, and Col. Rudolf Abel, the Soviet spy.

Mr. Van Altena was released in 1966 without publicity. By that time four other Americans had been arrested in East Berlin and Mr. Rabb agreed to work for their freedom also.

They were: Mary Ellen Battle of Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Moses Reese Herrin of Akron, Ohio; Frederick Matthews of Ellwood City, Pa. and William W. Lovett of San Francisco. The first three were charged with having helped East Germans escape to the West; Mr. Lovett was arrested in connection with a traffic accident and on charges of carrying a concealed weapon.

Working with Messrs. Stange and Vogel, the two Berlin lawyers, Mr. Rabb obtained the release of the four in February, 1967. He had arranged coded Telex communications between his Wall Street Office and Mr. Vogel's office in East Berlin to speed the long and complicated negotiations.

The seventh American released through Mr. Rabb's mediation effort was Peter T. Feinauer of Providence, R.I., who was arrested in October, 1966, on charges of espionage for the Central Intelligence Agency and of helping East Germans to flee to the West. He was freed last month.

Mr. Rabb has received a personal note from Secretary of State Dean Rusk extending "warm appreciation and congratulations" for the effort. The lawyer said he paid for all of his travels to Berlin on his own and accepted no fees from the prisoners.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN URBAN AFFAIRS TASK FORCE

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House Republican Urban Affairs Task Force will have as its guest on Thursday the executive director of the Urban League, Whitney Young. The task force hearing will convene at 12 noon in room 202 of the Capitol.

This is the 12th in a series of House Republican Urban Affairs Task Force Hearings. Some of the featured witnesses at earlier hearings were John W. Gardner, president of the Urban Coalition; John V. Lindsay, mayor of New York City; Samuel C. Jackson, of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; and Wright Elliott, of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Urban Affairs Task Force has either sponsored or introduced six items of legislation, including the Manpower Act of 1968, the Community Service Officer Act which is now a part of the omnibus crime bill, and the "human renewal fund."

At the conclusion of the present series of hearings, the task force will issue a summary statement on its activities, including the testimony of witnesses and the legislation introduced and endorsed by the task force.

MANAGING FOR A BETTER AMERICA

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the Federal Government, State government and local government, either alone or in concert, cannot solve the problem of poverty and its debilitating side effects.

For more than 35 years, this Nation has been involved at the governmental level in some of the most imaginative, far-reaching and humanitarian social-welfare programs ever dreamed of or devised by man.

But times change. Populations increase. Old problems grow. New problems arise and Government programs, even if adequate, simply cannot maintain the pace. The lag between socioeconomic change and governmental action is quantitatively and qualitatively too great to bridge.

In the latter half of this decade, particularly of the past 5 years, it has been increasingly apparent that the private sector of our economy has a role which must be played in attacking and alleviating many of America's social and welfare problems.

Fortunately, with this realization has come an increasing recognition of its role by the business community and a willingness for its undertaking.

Call it "enlightened self interest," if you like, or call it simply a sense of moral obligation to one's community and fellow man. However, business firms and organizations nationwide are being moved to action. Amidst the many ills which this Nation allegedly suffers, this is a very healthy sign.

To be very honest, it is not easy for corporate interest and community interest to sit and work together on the same board of directors. Never before in our history has American industry been faced with so many competitive concerns both at home and abroad. But the fact is increasingly evident that corporate and community interest are not mutually exclusive, but are very compatible.

In my own community, our Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce has applied its considerable leadership to the task of alleviation of ghetto problems.

This has come about, not through any dramatic breakthrough, but through a growing realization and understanding of the problems of the poor and their implications for the growth of our community.

An outstanding example of its spirit of community concern is the report to the board of governors of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce by Mr. Noah Liff, president of the Tennessee Steel & Supply Co., made as a result of his participation in the recent American Management Association's New York seminar on "Managing for a Better America."

Mr. Speaker, the report speaks glowingly for itself. It is an outstanding ex-

ample of positive thinking directed at the needs of our urban slums by the American businessman. Under unanimous consent I include the report by Mr. Liff in the RECORD at this point and I commend it to the attention and consideration of my colleagues:

REPORT TO NASHVILLE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF GOVERNORS BY NOAH LIFF, PRESIDENT, TENNESSEE STEEL & SUPPLY CO., JUNE 14, 1968

It is not very often that one has the opportunity of pretending to be an authority on any subject without being at least 100 miles away from home. Being in front of such a distinguished group as the Board of Governors of the Chamber of Commerce, I must admit to being a bit presumptuous—for I am at home—not 100 miles away.

However, Ed Shea's invitation to represent the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce at the recent American Management Association's New York seminar entitled "Managing for a Better America"—an in-depth "studying" seminar on private industry's mobilization for urban action—gives me the opportunity to pose, temporarily at least, as an expert on the subject. We all know that it takes more than a seminar to be an expert, but the message which I bring you today at the behest of some of America's outstanding financial minds is an authoritative message—an urgent message—in fact, a very dramatic message—of which I am just the messenger boy.

Last week in New York City at the Americana Hotel, a group of some 1,000 of America's top business firms was represented at the A.M.A. seminar on what was described as "the most pressing and urgent problem in America today"—namely, the "urban crisis." This august assemblage read like Fortune Magazine's select group of the top 500 of America's industrial and financial giants. Distinguished American businessmen such as Floyd Hall, Chairman of the Board of Eastern Airlines; Christian Herter, Jr., Vice President of Mobil Oil; John Harper, Chairman of the Board of Alcoa; Henry Hillman, President of Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co.; Charles Adams, Chairman of the Board of Raytheon Co.; Mayor John Lindsay; Senator Jacob Javits; and Vice President Hubert Humphrey—to name but a few—headed a distinguished list of speakers addressing an equally distinguished group of board chairmen, presidents and vice presidents of America's top companies. These were not the beatniks of America—the starry-eyed liberals—or the left-wingers. This group was a cross-section of America's finest conservative business community.

And this group had gathered to address itself to the thesis that the "Private Sector" of America—the business community—had a real contribution to make in solving America's most devious problem of the past 100 years. Not since the war of a century ago has this nation been so split asunder.

Gentlemen, this was a meeting of rare experience. It was not the typical seminar—the usual convention rhetoric. It was charged with an honesty—an urgency—a sense of emotion, as these people accepted the responsibility of truly leading America where perhaps the public, religious, labor, and educational communities have defaulted in dealing with the urban crisis. Perhaps "defaulted" is too strong a word—perhaps there was a feeling of some guilt for the neglect of this problem which our business community has characteristically shown in this matter—but, nevertheless, it was indeed a call to action to the free-enterprise system and to those of us who still have a real romance going with the American capitalistic system. It was a recognition that welfare programs have not solved our community's ills—but, in fact, may have contributed to them. And

those of us who were there were asked to bring this message back to our respective Chambers of Commerce and our city governments. I am here today to report to the governing body of Nashville's Chamber of Commerce—for its due consideration—the results of this New York meeting.

Distinguished speakers—one after the other—discussed the economics of business participation in Urban Action Programs. Perhaps the most significant comment of all was made by Mayor Lindsay and by Honorable Arthur Fleming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, when on separate occasions they spoke of the report by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. They suggested that government and civic leaders who were in positions of responsibility and authority should disqualify themselves in the decision-making processes relating to the urban crisis until they had read and digested this report.

This study—prepared by a group of America's outstanding bi-partisan figures—is a *must*—an immediate *must*—on everyone's reading list. I will go a step further for when I say "on your reading list" this almost indicates "at your leisure." This is something that should be done promptly—with a sense of urgency. Mayor Lindsay said, "I don't mean you should read a 'condensation' or a 'report on the report' but you should read the report itself."

Gentlemen, I can assure you that I have now read this report. I further assure you that many of my own preconceived ideas about the riots, who caused them, what caused them, and what we must do to prevent them from re-occurring have changed. I strongly urge each of you to make a personal commitment to read and digest this report immediately.

But specifically, back to the role of the business community. Quoting from the report itself, "We conclude that maximum utilization of the tremendous capability of the American free-enterprise system is a crucial element in any program for improving conditions in both our urban centers and our rural poverty areas which have brought us to this present crisis."

"The maintenance of public order is primarily the responsibility of the Public Sector but the Private Sector is the mainspring of the national economy and consequently of the economic well-being of our citizens."

The report goes on further to state, "We believe that these widely-shared sentiments about the role of the business community are more than mere rhetoric. The Private Sector has shown its concern and capability for making contributions in the fields relevant to the urban crisis."

Where are some of the areas that the Private Sector can make some of the sweets of our society available to the ghetto resident?

1. On-the-job training and employment such as the government's MA-3 program and the OJT program.

2. Economic development of the ghetto areas in the form of capital investment and loan assistance and additional housing.

3. Encouragement of Negro entrepreneurship.

4. Basic education on the job site.

5. And, perhaps the most difficult of all, an attitude change in our approach to the Negro and the ghetto resident.

Many of these things have already been started in Nashville—but only in minuscule quantities. We need to do more and with genuine enthusiasm—and the leadership for these activities should come from our Chamber.

Particularly, what can we do as business people in Nashville—through the Chamber of Commerce and as executives in our individual firms?

1. Firstly, a dramatic announcement of the recognition of the problem should be made

by the Chamber of Commerce. With a loud and public commitment the Chamber should tell the community that we do mean business—that we recognize the problems of the ghetto as our #1 dilemma—that we are committed to the free enterprise system—and that we have something to offer. The Public Sector must feel secure with the support of the Private Sector. The ghetto people must know that we honestly mean business—not more broken promises—not lip service—but a public commitment of our resolve on this matter. We must *honestly* state we know all ills cannot be cured overnight. We likewise must say that we are not hiding behind gradualism as an excuse for doing as little as possible. When we go out to sell our Nashville Plus Program to out-of-state prospects, they will have to be favorably impressed with a community—particularly a Southern community—which is attacking the urban crisis aggressively—and not waiting for this sickness to overwhelm us.

2. Secondly, providing on the Chamber of Commerce staff—in our next budget—one full-time executive staff member—either a present employee or a new employee—whose course of work would be coordinating the Chamber's efforts in the area of the urban crisis along with the activities of the Public Sector and the communication within the Ghetto Sector. He would advise and assist this Board and other staff members in their decision-making processes—giving this Board the background and depth of information which is not available to the Board through normal news media. His work would not only involve the ghetto—but would coordinate our entire concern about the physical decay of our City.

3. The immediate vigorous backing of the Fair Employment Ordinances now before the Metropolitan Council—the same vigorous backing which was afforded other important issues such as whiskey-by-the-drink.

4. Immediate involvement and commitment by the Chamber and its members to the hiring in private industry of the hard-core-poverty-area people and working through the various community employment services. Due to the fact that Nashville is not one of the 50 largest cities in the United States, we do not have a chapter of the National Alliance of Businessmen, which Henry Ford is heading at the behest of the President. The N.A.B. is committed to furnishing 100,000 immediate permanent jobs for the hard-core unemployed and 200,000 summertime jobs. But we do have other organizations—such as Project Equality—through which we can work.

5. A Chamber-sponsored seminar for all our members—similar to the A.M.A. seminar in New York—to indoctrinate our members in effective implementation of techniques to be used hiring hard-core-poverty-area people. This seminar would be a real starting point.

6. And, equally important, the Chamber of Commerce and its members should make a concerted effort with our Senators and Congressmen and our other friends in the Federal Congress for the passage of an intelligent tax-incentive program to stimulate and implement the activities which I have described today. I think you will agree that private industry—with the proper stimulus—can do a job better, faster, and cheaper than the Federal Government.

But, most important is a recognition and commitment by the members of the Board here today that this is your time to act with decisiveness. Can we be counted on to act with courage? Can we be prepared to stand up and commit ourselves publicly?

Gentlemen, I too have a dream! One where American dreams are found in homes and in jobs—not in classroom schoolbooks! A dream where first and second grade children come to school properly nourished and properly clothed to start their lives as productive Americans—not as deductive Americans. I

dream that we can be a community in which we can look at our brothers as our brothers—every day—not just on Sunday when we talk about brethren. I dream of a greater Nashville—of a thriving, bustling Nashville—a true Athens of the South! I ask you to dream a bit with me.

DECENTRALIZATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House yesterday, there was presented a study prepared by the distinguished and very able gentleman from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] listing the Federal assistance programs which are now operating in the various departments and agencies of the executive branch. This report focuses attention on the rapid expansion in recent years of Federal grant-in-aid and other programs of assistance to States and local governments. So many programs have been established, often in competition with each other, that today it is difficult for the States and local governments to know exactly what exists and where specific information can be obtained.

I commend my colleague for his fine work. The information contained in his comprehensive report will be of great service, particularly to the Congress which has a responsibility to maintain an effective and continuing review of the operations of the executive branch. His proposal to create a centralized catalog on Federal assistance programs could be of great benefit.

More needs to be done. As Mr. Roscoe Drummond has pointed out in his column which appeared in the Washington Post today, June 26, 1968, the decentralization of Federal assistance programs must be the next step. Mr. Drummond suggests the creation of a new commission patterned after the Hoover Commissions of the past which have contributed greatly to reforms in the operations of the executive branch. I have cosponsored a bill, H.R. 80, to establish a Commission on the Organization of the executive branch of the Government to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of public business in the departments and agencies of Government, and fully agree with Mr. Drummond that action in this area is needed.

Mr. Drummond's comments follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1968]
FEDERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS NEED DECENTRALIZATION BADLY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Federal administration of billions of dollars in aid to millions of Americans is so tangled today nobody knows how bad things are.

The need is urgent to rescue from itself the sprawling, chaotic, inefficient, overburdened, overcostly maze of Federal assistance programs.

Democratic liberals like the late Robert Kennedy, JFK aides Daniel Moynihan and Richard Goodwin, and Republican conservatives like Congressmen Melvin Laird, Gerald Ford and Charles Goodell have for some time

been suggesting that the Federal complex has become so big, so cumbersome, so overlapping that it simply can't any longer do its job.

The need is to decentralize not just a little bit, but radically, functions, funds, and authority so that state and local government—near to the people—can begin to do the job on a scale which is manageable.

New facts which reveal how bad the situation is come from a heroic effort of a lone first-term Congressman, William V. Roth (R. Del.) who set out four months ago to survey the entire Federal establishment to find out just how many programs of Federal assistance there are, what they do, how and where they are administered.

His findings justify virtually everything that has been said about the labyrinth of overgrown national Government. He found:

That nobody knows how many Federal programs there are and that there is no place to go in the whole Federal system to find out.

That Congress simply does not have the information to judge which programs should be kept and which should be stopped.

That the Executive Branch does not have the information to find overlapping and duplication and thereby to unify and streamline the operation.

That at the very least the Federal Government is attempting to administer 1050 assistance programs designed to dispense more than 20 billion dollars a year.

That as many as ten Cabinet-level departments and 15 or more agencies operate programs devoted essentially to the same purpose.

No wonder Democrats and Republicans alike, conservatives and liberals alike, and many who used to think let-Washington-do-it was the answer to every social ill are beginning to see and to say that functions, funds, and initiative need to be turned back to state and local government.

This is why Moynihan, Assistant Secretary of Labor under President Kennedy and now head of the Harvard-MIT Urban Affairs Center, bluntly asserts that, while the Federal Government has proved itself massively efficient at collecting taxes, it has shown itself massively inefficient at dispensing Federal Services.

Rep. Roth's titanic study of Administrative dishevelment ought to stir Congress and the White House to action. His immediate proposal is modest—that the Government be directed to put into a single catalogue a lucid report on all Federal assistance programs and what the citizen needs to know to use them.

It would be a beginning just to get at the facts. But far more needs to be done—and soon. A special congressional presidential commission, like the Hoover Commission, ought to be put to work at once to study how best to decentralize Federal assistance programs and to report to the new Congress early enough so that action could be forthcoming next year.

There is little doubt that decentralization of the unwieldy Federal sprawl is coming. It ought to be brought about in an orderly, well-planned manner. This is why Congress ought to put it in motion now.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 156th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON: A GREAT CONSUMER PRESIDENT

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this week we pay tribute to the 30th anniversary of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Speaking for every American, the President said:

During this week, while we are paying tribute to the historical significance of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, I hope that each of us will pause to consider the genius of the American marketplace, which is the envy of the world. But let us also resolve that our great ability to raise, manufacture, distribute and sell products to meet every human need be used to enhance the quality of American life for every man, woman and child—for every American consumer.

I congratulate President Johnson for addressing himself, once again, to the need for consumer justice to protect the health and safety of the American public.

I want to commend the President for his forthright and continued interest in the area of consumer protection.

In the President's words:

In the last three years, the Congress has enacted major legislation to provide for high way safety, fair packaging, wholesome meat, protection against flammable fabrics, home appliance safety, safe toys, adequate clinical laboratory standards, fire research and safety, truth-in-lending, and the establishment of a National Commission on Product safety.

Under unanimous consent I submit the statement by the President on the 30th anniversary of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT

Thirty years ago, on June 25, 1938, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law a great landmark in this Nation's history of consumer protection: The Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act.

That legislation was an initial effort to meet a whole new set of problems as the American marketplace moved from the corner grocery into the age of the supermarket.

It set forth this Government's basic principles for maintaining the quality and integrity of the market in the 20th Century, and it directed the agencies of this Government to ensure that these principles would prevail.

These principles have been buttressed over the past thirty years by a series of amendments that have benefited both buyer and merchant—both the American consumer and American business. They have provided for the certification of insulin, penicillin, and other life-saving antibiotics; for setting limits on the usage of pesticides; for establishing the safe use of food additives and color additives; for assuring that all drugs are safe as well as effective, and for the control of stimulant, depressant and hallucinogenic drugs.

Meanwhile, there have been long strides in other areas of consumer protection. In the last three years, the Congress has enacted major legislation to provide for highway safety, fair packaging, wholesome meat, protection against flammable fabrics, home appliance safety, safe toys, adequate clinical laboratory standards, fire research and safety,

truth-in-lending, and the establishment of a National Commission on Product Safety.

We have new Federal guardians of the marketplace: the first Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, the first Consumer Counsel in the Department of Justice, the first Presidential Committee on Consumer Interests, and, within the last two weeks, the new Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

With all that, however, the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act continues to provide an important basis for expanding the protection that American consumers need to remain the sovereign of the marketplace.

During this week, while we are paying tribute to the historical significance of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, I hope that each of us will pause to consider the genius of the American marketplace, which is the envy of the world. But let us also resolve that our great ability to raise, manufacture, distribute and sell products to meet every human need be used to enhance the quality of American life for every man, woman and child—for every American consumer.

UNITED STATES-GREAT BRITAIN TRADE

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the United States and Britain have always enjoyed a special relationship—a relationship founded on family ties, reinforced by a common cultural heritage, and cemented by a common language.

The common language has its problems. As Oscar Wilde noted several decades ago, the only thing that separates our two countries is our common language.

But though the American tourist in London stumbles around on his first few days before he discovers he takes "a tube," not a subway; "a lift," not an elevator; and that the hood on his car is the "bonnet," the trunk is the "boot," and the glove compartment the "pigeon hole," the benefits of an "almost" common language far outweigh the amusing disadvantages.

The social and historical links binding our two countries are reinforced today by commercial ties.

Both Britain and the United States are suffering at the present time from balance-of-payments problems, but it is rewarding to see that both countries still recognize the importance of their trade links and are not resorting to petty restrictions.

A recent, very successful example of Anglo-American exchange of trade was a joint United States-United Kingdom trade exhibition in Harrods, London, opened by David Bruce, the U.S. Ambassador to Britain.

The exhibition was the first in Britain to be supported by the U.S. Commerce Department. It was a tremendous success.

Under unanimous consent I submit a story from the New York Times which provides a full account of the exhibition for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 4, 1968]
HARRODS SHOWING FINER U.S. WARES—BRITISH SHOPPERS DISPLAYING A FAVORABLE REACTION
(By John M. Lee)

LONDON, March 3.—High-quality United States merchandise, at high-quality United States prices, is presented in a six-week promotion that was opened last week at Harrods, the elegant London department store.

A favorable reaction from British shoppers was reported. The exhibition, the first in Britain to be supported by the United States Commerce Department, is called "The Best of Both Worlds Export Promotion" and shows both American and British goods in a decor of eagles and lions.

The exhibition sheds light on the foreign attitudes toward American merchandise and suggests possibilities as well as problems for American consumer exports.

Many promotions of American goods have been held in European department stores that cater to mass markets. As a result, it has been said, the goods shown tended to be low-priced and of less than first quality in design and execution.

QUESTIONS RAISED

Although some lines were popular, such as colorful California sportswear and almost anything Western, questions were raised whether the United States had anything distinctive to offer.

"Good American merchandise is expensive, especially here after devaluation," said the Harrods sales manager, William F. Metcalfe. "But we are a store that can sell expensive merchandise. We can show American goods at the quality and at the price they should be shown."

Alfred Spence, managing director (president) of Harrods, said: "I tell my buyers not to be afraid of price. There'll always be customers with the money and taste to buy quality."

The Harrods exhibition is keyed by a walk-through recreation of a colonial Williamsburg Street, with costumed salesgirls in the Williamsburg houses and shops. In the next department a Gemini space capsule is on display.

Among the American goods shown on all floors are Hathaway shirts at about \$8.50; Old Grand-Dad bourbon at \$8.34 (compared with \$5.94 for Harrods Scotch); Cole of California bikinis at \$43; Samsonite attaché cases at \$43; a KLH 24 stereo music system at \$504 and a 16½-cubic-foot Admiral Refrigerator-freezer at \$588.

British goods include an umbrella with gold-plated nose at \$23; a Wedgwood vase at \$54 and a Silver Shadow Rolls-Royce at about \$25,000.

Mr. Metcalfe said Harrods normally carried American lines in foods (such as S & W), lingerie, California-style sportswear, gift items, stationery, housewares and fashion-minded household textiles such as Fieldcrest.

The sales manager said he was impressed with "the beautiful simple-styled American dresses for the mature woman" and coordinated boys' clothes from the United States. But in youth clothes, he said, British industry was "first in fashion and price."

Mr. Spence recalled that Harrods had done a good business in American barbecue sets last summer. But lest anyone think Harrods was losing its chic, someone recalled that a North Country farmer had walked in the other week and bought a Minton china tea set for \$4,320.

MUTUAL PROMOTION

For those puzzled over how Zenith phonographs and L'Aiglon Jersey dresses are aiding the British export causes, Harrods explained it was showing appreciation for the 158 British promotions in United States stores last year and that it was also constantly engaged in displaying British goods to stimulate American interest.

Harrods said its own over-the-counter exports totaled about \$7.2-million a year.

The theme of mutual back-scratching was echoed by David Bruce, the United States Ambassador to Britain, who opened the exhibition with a short speech deploring "buy American" and "buy British" domestic campaigns and calling for more two-way trade. Lord Brown, Britain's Minister of State for Exports, said he thoroughly agreed.

MEMPHIS TACKLES ITS OWN BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to share with my colleagues a success story on how the people of Memphis are tackling their own problem of beautifying the city and cleaning up slum blight.

Under the leadership of Memphis business and community leaders a program called Cleani-Miniparks has transformed 26 neighborhood eyesores into spots of beauty and playground areas for youngsters in the poorer sections of the city. This accomplishment was brought about entirely through local initiative and with local funds. It is a glowing example of how many of our local problems could be solved if we exercise some good old American initiative and know-how in our local communities instead of running to the Federal Government for a solution to every problem.

The Cleani-Miniparks project and its success is described in the following news story from the Memphis Commercial Appeal in its issue of June 10, 1968:

IDEAS OF EXPANSION GROW IN CLEANI-MINIPARKS

The imagination of Memphis has been fired by an idea barely a month old which has transformed 26 neighborhood eyesores into sparkling playgrounds for children.

The cleani-miniparks burst onto the city in May.

They now may spread from one end of the city to another, pulling into their contagion mothers, fathers, children, businessmen, land owners, architects, city officials and just plain people.

William E. Shelton III, chairman of the committee that launched the minipark program, said yesterday a total of 50 are expected to be created by the end of this month.

Mr. Shelton said as many as 24 more cleani-miniparks may come after "an almost unbelievable response from persons wanting to build new parks, improve existing ones, offering services to make the project easier and suggesting other services to go along with neighborhood parks."

"Since last weekend we have had approximately 25 calls from people with lots that they would let us use and they are in neighborhoods which want to make improvements," he said.

The first instant park was created May 11 at 577 Linden. Volunteers, guided by Mr. Shelton's Clean-up, Paint-up, Fix-up Committee, cleared the small lot of litter and installed equipment bought from the Park Commission.

The committee planned to set up miniparks during its Clean-up, Paint-up, Fix-up

campaign during May. By June 1, there were 26 instant parks with most in poverty-level neighborhoods.

As the program rolled into June, business firms began donating equipment and money. Manpower also came from organizations and neighborhood residents.

Mr. Shelton said yesterday, "It is our hope now that if enough money can be donated for this effort, other parks will spring up although the May campaign is over."

He said the clean-miniparks have received no government money. To fulfill hopes of finishing 24 new parks this month, an additional \$8,000 to \$12,000 is needed.

The parks "have been a catalyst for developing neighborhood pride and cooperation," Mr. Shelton said.

"Not a single thing has been taken or broken. The neighbors have assumed responsibility and nothing has been damaged."

An example of the pride came last week when neighbors, who thought the park at 577 Linden was so nice, decided more space and added facilities would be nicer. They built an annex, installed barbecue pits and a picnic table and planted flowers.

A neighborhood beautification club added a sliding board and several benches to the park at 2337 Dexter.

"This is the residual effect we have hoped would happen," said Mr. Shelton.

More help for the instant parks is expected. The Memphis Chapter of the American Institute of Architects volunteered to design inexpensive improvements; Bruce-Terminix Co. of Memphis offered rodent control; Nurses at the Baptist Hospital School of Nursing want to help in follow-up programs at the parks.

More money is expected, too. Employees of the Prudential Ordinary Life Insurance Agency agreed to spend about \$250 which is normally used for their annual picnic and they also want to volunteer their labor.

Employees of Wurzburg Bros., Inc., offered money and labor. The Salvation Army wants to build two parks and other organizations have asked for information on how they can participate.

Information may be obtained from Mrs. Katherine Taylor at the City Beautiful Commission.

She has been active in coordinating activities with interested neighborhood groups, along with Mrs. Walter Armstrong, chairman of the commission, and Mrs. Theresa Manning, Mrs. Miloy Jonikan, Mrs. Mildred Byrd and Mrs. Mariam Grashot.

Mr. Shelton, a vice president of Leader Federal Savings and Loan Association, said he has been surprised by the extent of the development and acceptance of the parks which grew out of attempts "to explore ways of motivating a massive cleanup campaign."

"I have been surprised at the number of children that were playing in the streets in these neighborhoods that were not within easy walking distance of one of our city parks," he said.

At times, when "there were so many kids you couldn't see the ground," more parks sprang up in an area. Examples are Texas Street and the area of Henry and Alaska.

Since he got into the minipark project, Mr. Shelton estimates, 80 per cent of his normal working hours have gone into it. He has further involved his firm.

Leader Federal underwrote insurance for the first 16 parks. When Clean-Mini Park, Inc., was formed to lease the lots for one dollar a year, Charles R. Sherman, president of the company, worked out corporate details, and Roy M. Marr, chairman of Leader Federal, handled insurance arrangements.

"Both were without precedent," said Mr. Shelton.

Mr. Shelton has been with Leader Federal since 1965 when he resigned as executive secretary of the Downtown Association of Memphis.

While serving with the Downtown Association, he was instrumental in such projects as cleaning and beautifying downtown streets with urns planted with greenery and developing plans for Beale Street urban renewal.

The miniparks program is a logical extension into the entire city of this interest in sprucing up the downtown area. "We came across the miniparks idea while trying to figure a way to get neighborhoods cleaned up," he says.

AGNEW PROPOSES URBAN SOLUTIONS

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honorable Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of Maryland, testified before the Minority Task Force on Urban Affairs about the problems of our cities. Governor Agnew proposed some innovative approaches to alleviating the conditions which are encroaching on the welfare of our cities and their inhabitants. Certainly these suggestions merit careful study and consideration by the Members of this body.

I commend the Governor's statement, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues:

TESTIMONY BY GOV. SPIRO T. AGNEW, BEFORE REPUBLICAN TASK FORCE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

The most perplexing problem of America today is the problem of the cities. This truism has been repeated so often in the past months that it has become a cliché. Urban crisis has become a standard phrase in our vocabulary. Urban violence has become an expected way of life. Obviously, we are concerned with the problems of our cities, obviously we are attempting to do something corrective, and just as obviously we are failing. Why?

In the first place, I believe we have failed to identify root causes. We tend to approach urban problems in a monolithic manner and to treat the symptom rather than cure the disease. Harvard political scientist, James Q. Wilson, writes: "Speaking of urban problems has real dangers for it lends to the substitution of effect for cause and thus the misdirection of remedial action." Although there is general agreement on the evidence of urban crisis—blight, poverty, crime, pollution, traffic congestion—Wilson correctly cites that "slums and bums and cars are not the cause of the problems, they are the symptoms, and if we tear them down or clear them out or ban them from one place, they will inevitably reappear somewhere else."

Ultimate resolution of urban problems, genuine urban renewal, rather than just relocation of trouble, depends on accurate analysis of the problems' source and adequate action to terminate basic causes. What lies at the heart of the urban crisis?

Essentially, the answer is the abrasive impact of the less affluent, caused by two flows of population: the exodus of the educated, employed and economically well-off families to the suburbs, and the migration of the uneducated, unemployed and impoverished to the cities. Tax producers are constantly being exchanged for revenue consumers. As assessable wealth decreases, the multitude of secondary problems (poverty, blight, traffic congestion, crime) increases. Government, recognizing these problems, has launched programs designed to combat the

secondary effects while the primary cause continues unchecked.

Until we act directly to stabilize and then selectively reduce the population density of our cities, all fancy, expensive social programming is no more than an exercise in futility. We have been operating under a fallacious premise and, in the vernacular of the day, spinning our wheels. If, in our highly mobilized society, the pattern of suburban exodus, rural migration cannot be altogether stopped, it can be controlled and directed.

Two bold concepts—dramatic departures from present practices—could provide the solution. First is the transfer of all welfare responsibilities to the Federal government. The machinery and the example to administer such a program already exist in the National Social Security Administration.

With Federal controls establishing uniform standards and benefits which will extend from Watts to Harlem—from the Mississippi Delta to Detroit—the flow of untrained, unemployed and impoverished will be immeasurably reduced and possibly reversed.

An immediate criticism to national standardized welfare payments arises from the varying costs of living in different sections of the country. Admittedly, a dollar buys more in Arkansas than in New York. But standardized social security payments are universally accepted and standardized welfare payments are no less logical. Second, standardization could serve as a positive force, making it not only possible but profitable to remain in a rural, underdeveloped area. Once the uneducated, unemployed population is stabilized—at Federal expense—states and cities could afford to initiate meaningful programs at the local level related to local employment opportunities and manpower needs. How can you solve the job problem, when the unemployed won't stay put?

Finally, a national welfare program provides a healthy, economical alternative to present and proposed policies. Tremendous duplication already exists as a result of the Federal, state and local governments all being in the welfare business. The current Federal effort alone is a bewildering kettle of alphabet soup involving HEW, OEO, HUD and a cast of thousands. (Here give Baltimore City example of no incentive to save.) There appears little desire for coordination, evaluation or continuity. The pursuit of commendable objectives has all too often been perverted and obscured by deplorable abuses. The most recent incident reported just last week involved the expenditure of \$927,000 in OEO funds to support a Chicago street gang, the Blackstone Rangers. While this case may be exaggerated or extreme; disenchantment, disillusionment, and dissension over poverty programs are widespread. Moreover, the intensive investment in palliative inner city projects reinforces the myth of urban opportunity drawing more people to the cities and consequently compounding the primary problem of impact. All too often the well-intentioned but frantic giveaway schemes never help the poor because the money is intercepted and perverted to build militant political organizations.

I am a Republican whose career in public service has been confined to local and State government. My private beliefs and public experiences reinforce my confidence that the government closest to the people is the unit which can govern best. Yet, I am convinced that a national welfare program, administered and supported by the Federal government, is imperative to: 1) stabilize the nation's impoverished, uneducated and unemployed population; 2) relieve the cities and states of an impossible and insurmountable burden; and 3) free state and local governments to move forward with positive, constructive solutions within their fiscal and administrative capabilities.

The second concept requires a complete departure from traditional vision of what

a city should and could be. It goes one step beyond present urban planning and renewal. It is daring, yet it is not new. This is the satellite city concept, which was first popularized by the Eisenhower Administration. The satellite city is an imaginative alternative to urban blight and suburban sprawl. It is an absolute answer to urban impaction, to prejudice-born ghettos and pockets of poverty.

The initial premise justifying satellite city development is the view that an inner city should operate primarily as a cultural-commercial-communications core. It should be a place where people work and play; the market place and entertainment center of a metropolitan area. Its industry should be highly selective—only that requiring city locus, such as its port, railroad and airport functions. It should be the repository for great educational, cultural and recreational facilities. Conversely, in our highly mobilized society, it should not be primarily a residential center. Housing should be available for those who want the dynamic tempo of city life, rather than an externally imposed necessity for those restricted by economics or prejudice from suburban living.

Ideally, many satellite cities surround the inner city. These communities offer diversified housing, community services and employment. No satellite contains a disproportionate mix of housing or industry but a balance to provide a solid economic base. Maryland is fortunate that it can claim an ideal example, Columbia—founded and sponsored solely by private enterprise.

However, few industries have the resources or the right to risk such extensive investment in a single project. For this reason, all levels of government should partly subsidize the foundation of satellite cities in much the same way our urban renewal projects are now financed. Government can plan the city, buy the land, provide zoning, grading, clearing, roads, sewers, storm drains, transit and power lines. Then, private developers can bid to acquire all or portions of the land, subject to their developing in accordance with the plan.

New planned communities would not only guarantee open housing but also would serve as the nucleus for Negro commercial enterprise. The government can give special breaks or incentives for the Negro commercial or industrial entrepreneur. We can make it so profitable that the private developer cannot afford to stay out of the low-cost housing business. Psychologically, the satellite city is ideal for successful integrated housing. Here, Whites and Negroes start out alike in a new community without the entrenched neighborhood cliques that tend to discriminate against any newcomer, regardless of race or creed. Here, Whites and Negroes share common bonds and interests, from pride in their new homes to worries over their new mortgages.

Finally, planned communities can prevent urban sprawl. Conveniently located new industry can provide work and attract modest income families. Satellite communities not only eliminate blight and alleviate crowding; they assure an alternative to simply shifting blight through urban renewal dislocation and provide the potential to prevent further neighborhood deterioration ultimately requiring additional urban renewal projects.

I believe these two radical departures from present attempts to answer the urban crisis are valid for they reach the root of the problem. A national welfare program will provide essential social stability; a satellite city plan will encourage balanced development and halt the build-up of abrasive crowding as well as economic and social segregation.

A complete reappraisal of the complex functional relationships of local, state and Federal governments in urban affairs is necessary. The respective Executive branches have a major role and responsibility in this

area, but Congress can contribute substantially to revision of present policies and reform of present practices.

An unholy alliance between big cities and the Federal government has developed which could devastate the principle and purpose of our federal system. There is a measure of historical justification for this situation since State governments—prior to reapportionment—often failed to take interest in, or responsibility for, urban problems. However, this neglect has been largely corrected. Today, state governments are well-prepared and eager to participate in urban programs. We realize that the problem of America is the problem of the cities—that one percent of American land where 70 per cent of Americans live. We recognize that almost every state's prosperity is ultimately linked to its one or several commercial centers. If these are allowed to decay or implode, the wealth of the entire state can erode and eventually disappear.

Maryland, I believe, exemplifies this new determination on the part of State governments. My inauguration coincided with the first session of a reapportioned Legislature. In that session we enacted a comprehensive fiscal reform program that provided additional revenue and alternative revenue resources to Maryland's cities and metropolitan areas. Baltimore City, alone, gained almost \$50 million in gross benefits, including unprecedented, urban-oriented State aid for local police and inner-city schools.

However, our efforts are frustrated not only by our lack of revenue but by the Federal government's current practice, which is to widely scatter seed money and after a year or two withdraw or curtail support. This leaves the city with its extremely limited resources to foot the bill. The city is forced either to cut off programs, raise already high taxes, or appeal for state aid. Thus, the State government—previously ignored by the Federal-city alliance—winds up holding the bag or the bill.

Our problems are compounded by the tremendous financial burdens placed on the state by such rapidly changing Federal programs as Medicare-Medicaid; and by the fluctuations in our anticipated tax revenues caused by national monetary policies. In addition, the Federal government's own fiscal problems have resulted in vacillation over Federal aid, causing State uncertainty as to whether we can proceed in diverse fields from employment opportunities to urban interstate highway construction.

Consistency in Federal policy and consistency in Federal aid commitments are imperative if the State is to plan properly and the city is to keep its promises to the poor. On the other hand, I am aware and concerned that, as Governor Nelson Rockefeller has noted, "as a nation we are close to becoming dangerously over-committed." I share former Vice President Richard Nixon's view that "the only thing worse than failing to fulfill a promise, is making a promise, fully cognizant, that it cannot be fulfilled."

Presently, most significant federal aid is by way of categorical grant. In many cases the incompatibility of such restrictive assistance with existing State programs prohibits full utilization of the aid. There seems to be a recent trend toward bloc grants—for example, the recently enacted Safe Streets Law. Every Governor I have talked to, regardless of Party, is enthusiastic about the flexibility of bloc grants. It is suggested that the Congress consider grants in such broad areas as transportation and health; rather than roads, mass transit or heart, stroke and cancer. A metropolitan transit system doesn't really excite a state like Alaska or Wyoming, and I am sure those Governors would appreciate the ability to convert that assistance to their roads programs.

As to equalization, we have too long considered a combination of assessable wealth and income. I believe we should consider the

ascertainable effort, the overall burden on the taxpayer.

Finally, I would leave with you a few general thoughts. Great countries collapse only when their foundations decay. Today, the footings of America are rotting while most of us stand fretfully by, watching with morbid curiosity. The disease of our times is an artificial and masochistic sophistication—a vague uneasiness that our values are corny—that there is something wrong with being patriotic, honest, moral or hardworking. The sneer of the non-conformist has become an effective weapon for those who cannot achieve within the framework of our society and, therefore, seek to destroy it.

Above all, as Republicans we should adhere to our proven values. I believe we agree guaranteed employment is preferable to public spending. Local initiative is more effective than Federal infringement. If America is to have revolution let it be one of ideas and approaches; let it occur in Congress rather than the streets. We cannot stand still for lawlessness and we will not stand still with progressive laws.

DIGNITY, OPPORTUNITY, RESPONSIBILITY

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the separation of church and state, which is guaranteed under our Constitution, has created differing spheres of activity for the religious and the civic life of our Nation. Yet their influence upon one another, and their different approaches to similar problems, has permitted the two to cooperate in providing our citizens a fuller community life.

In this present time of uncertainty—reflected in disorder that undermines both religious and civic life—good advice and sound reasoning are in short supply, and we should recognize and heed it from wherever it may come.

To my mind some sound advice was recently given to my home community of Waterbury, Conn., by the Rev. James McDonnell. Speaking at the Church of the Blessed Sacrament, of which I was for many years a parishioner, on Mother's Day, Father McDonnell presented an eloquent and timely statement of faith in our democratic principles, and the moral responsibility necessary to preserve and improve our Government.

I commend Father McDonnell's sermon to the attention of my colleagues, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

DIGNITY, OPPORTUNITY, RESPONSIBILITY

Today is Mother's Day. It is customary on this day to speak a few words of praise for all Mothers, living and dead. On this Mother's Day, however, I must put aside these remarks and speak on a topic of great importance. Perhaps I might best start my remarks by reading a letter which has been sent to you by Archbishop O'Brien. . . .

Although in the past I have always refrained from using the pulpit as a means of expressing myself on certain debatable issues and although it has always been my personal policy never to sign questionable proclamations of civic nature to which I would prefix my name with the title "Father", it seems that today those personal convictions must be temporarily put aside. Today, I am told to

speak on the morality of civil rights. I will, therefore, speak but I must express what I honestly and personally feel.

I

There is no doubt at all that the world, the nation, the city and the community is in great confusion and great anxiety. I do not have to enumerate the issues that are found in the headlines and the news reports. There is war, there is crime, there is the revolt of the younger generation, there is the abuse of drugs, there is the lack of leadership and the pressure of quick and immediate solutions to all problems. One issue, which may be indirectly connected with all the other problems and the one issue that seems most pressing upon the everyday life of the community is that of civil rights.

I will attempt to express just what my feelings are upon this subject.

I firmly believe with all my heart in the "dignity of man." He is a creature of God and a brother of Jesus Christ. He has an immortal soul and Heaven will be his final home. I believe that every man should be treated with human respect. He should be given the means to educate himself. He should be given an equal opportunity to secure dignified work and provide for himself and his family. He should be allowed to express himself in free discussion. He should be allowed to put force into his convictions through a system of voting. Every man should be given a chance to own property and to enjoy the pleasures of leisure time. I believe in the "dignity of man".

I also believe that any discrimination against man because of his race, color or religion should be thoroughly condemned by society. I do not think that the inhumanities upon the Irish by the English of the last century or the atrocities upon the Jewish people by the Nazis of this century should ever be allowed to be repeated—even in a mitigated way—in any country at any time. I am against discrimination of race, color or creed.

Finally, I am in favor of "equal opportunity". An equal opportunity for all—to work, to be educated to better himself, to be a responsible citizen of the community. Every one should have an "equal opportunity" to be someone.

II

But these basic beliefs must be made workable in a living, active local situation. And I must go on to describe my beliefs in another, more pragmatic area. When these rights are called into question then how are they to be handled.

It is my firm conviction that we of this country have the best form of government for us—a democracy. And I believe in this system of government which has as a basic tenet the power of the majority which has been expressed in free elections. In the republic to which we belong, it is the majority—always respecting the rights of the minority—which has the power and the right to determine just what shall be done and just what will not be done. I do not believe in minority domination. And most especially I do not believe in the minority domination when the minority smacks of militant radicalism. I believe in majority rule—not minority rule. Too often, it has become the case of the militant minority over-running the hesitant majority.

I also believe in law and order. Most civilized communities agree that for the good of everyone and for the protection of everyone, certain laws must be enacted for the common good. And furthermore, certain citizens must be given special powers to see to it that the law is obeyed. If the law is not obeyed then the offenders must be brought to trial for disturbing the welfare of the community and threatening the safety of all. We must have law and order and that law and order must be properly enforced . . . I do

not believe in the deliberate breaking of the law. I do not believe in deliberately taunting those who have been assigned by the community to see that the law is respected. I do not believe in window smashing . . . in looting . . . in sniping . . . in rock hurling . . . in burning . . . in grouping into gangs for the sheer purpose of destruction. I do not believe in chaos . . . I believe in law and order . . . I believe in respect for the law officers. I believe in just punishment for those who take it upon themselves to disregard the basic rules of civilized living. It will be a tragic day when disorderly demonstration and violence pay off better than law and order.

As another function of our way of government, I believe in intelligent discussion on issues that affect the community. We must be mature, intelligent and responsible people. We must have the maturity to listen to both sides of an issue. But when an assembly turns itself into a howling mob—then there is no longer an open and free discussion—there is emotional stupidity. I am for free discussion that will ultimately be put to a vote. I do not believe in hysteria, threats or finger shaking at any community assemblies. Legislation by intimidation is hardly proper procedure in a civilized community.

Along with the American form of government, I believe in the power and the use of the vote to settle community issues. If certain elements of the community are dissatisfied with the way that things are done, they have no right to resort to threats and violence. Everyone should vote. But always remember—the minority should not rule or over-ride the majority.

I believe in "equal opportunity". The equal opportunity for everyone to live, to go to school, to work, to better himself. An equal opportunity to compete and make good, an equal opportunity to meet a challenge and overcome it. An equal opportunity to sweat and to become a self made man. I believe in "equal opportunity"—I do not believe in handouts. I do not believe in subsidizing laziness. I do not believe in encouraging indifference by undermining initiative. I do not agree with those who insist that it is better to start at the top and work down, rather than to begin at the beginning and work up.

III

Finally, and perhaps of the greatest importance to this whole issue is the matter of leadership. The sad fact is—we are in dire need of it. We need the heroic leadership that the age calls for . . . We need leaders in our government, we need them in our community—and I dare say we need them in the Church. It is no easy task to be a true leader. Are they made or are they born . . . I don't know . . . But there is little evidence of leadership around. It is one thing to accept a position with all the prestige and power and influence that goes with it . . . It is quite another story for the men in high positions to provide the courage, the honesty, the direction, the wisdom, the understanding, the humility and the fortitude that leadership demands. . . . It is one thing to give orders and quite another thing to lead. We are in need of a man who will not say, "do this or do that." . . . We are looking for a man who will say with wisdom and courage . . . "come, follow me".

We of this community are faced with serious and grave issues. Some of these issues are associated with phrases like, "25 million dollars"—"middle schools as the solution"—"busing as the answer"—"tax increases" . . . We cannot escape these challenges. They won't go away or disappear like a bad dream. They are real and they are with us. The pressing issue of civil rights is now a part of our daily life—and it will not be easily and quickly settled.

But in our honest efforts to make this a better city and a happier community—

and in our attempts to solve our problems—let us ABSOLUTELY REFUSE to be brow-beaten by a militant and radical minority. Let us NOT LOSE our democratic heritage—let us not be TALKED OUT of our democratic processes—let us not be THREATENED by pressure groups—let us not be forced to say "Yes" when we should say "No"—let us not readily accept the words of the self-styled experts. . . . Let us not barter democracy, law and order, majority rule, free discussions and responsibility to appease a militant and radical minority . . . Let us not betray democracy for anarchy—for then there will be civil rights for no one.

As we pray for leaders to guide us, let us not be remiss in our own responsibilities. Our responsibility is to be informed—our responsibility is to partake in free discussion—our responsibility is to vote—our responsibility is to preserve the democratic processes of government. We must be faithful to these responsibilities if we ever expect liberty and freedom for all. . . . God preserve us from weakness and confusion.

At this time, I would ask you to join with me in the prayer of the faithful:

(1) O God, that we might always defend the true dignity of man and always condemn the evils of discrimination—We pray to the Lord . . .

(2) O God, that we might be honest in our community discussions and insist upon justice and fairness for all—We pray to the Lord . . .

(3) O God, that we might have leaders of wisdom, courage and perseverance—We pray to the Lord.

O God, today our community is sorrowful and confused. Let us look to God for our strength, our hope, our consolation. Let us pray to God to give us light to know what we are to do—and give us the strength to do it. . . . Through Christ our Lord, Amen.

WHY CONGRESSMAN HOWARD VOTED AGAINST THE TAX INCREASE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1968, the House of Representatives failed to meet its responsibilities to the people of the United States. It voted a 10-percent income tax surcharge—a tax which will hit the hard-working, average American taxpayer—but blandly closed its eyes to the desperate need for tax reform.

I voted against the 10-percent income tax surcharge because I feel very strongly that before we go into the pocket of the average American taxpayer, we should close up the many disgraceful tax loopholes which allow millionaires to pay not a penny in taxes each year as well as the loopholes which allow billion-dollar corporations to pay little or no taxes.

Mr. Speaker, where is the fairness in the Congress when such conditions are allowed to exist? We have highly powerful and well-financed lobbying groups, which, through influence, money, and pressure, continue to see that the tax loopholes are not closed.

Is it not the responsibility of each Member of this House to serve as a "lobbyist" for the average American who has no other way of protecting his hard-earned money? Is it not the responsi-

bility of each Member of this House to "lobby" against tax loopholes which force the average American working man and woman to pull the weight of this country and therefore pay a share of the taxes which should be contributed by the millionaires, excessively high-salaried corporation executives, and the coupon clippers?

The average American taxpayer—the man in the \$5,000 to \$20,000 income tax bracket—is completely justified in saying he does not want to be further taxed while a privileged group is paying little or no taxes at all.

On August 26, 1967, I filed a discharge petition with the Clerk of the House of Representatives to force a floor debate on the controversial oil depletion allowance. I need a total of 218 Members of Congress to sign this petition to force a debate and vote on the floor of the House. Regrettably, to date, only a handful of Members has been willing to stand up and fight the powerful oil and gas lobbyists by signing this discharge petition.

Former Senator Paul Douglas, who fought a dynamic battle against tax loopholes during his 18 years in the Senate, has recalled the experiences of his uphill battle. In the winter 1968, issue of the American Scholar Senator Douglas said:

Despite all of the propaganda and pressures there was a heroic group of Senators who stood firm. Once we got as many as thirty votes, but later we slumped to twenty. Calling for a rollcall vote was in a sense like marching brave troops into the valley of political death and reducing the number of public spirited soldiers. Therefore, toward the end of the long, bitter struggle, I would agree to a voice vote rather than a roll-call vote, in order to shield our secret supporters. I was willing, as were my comrades, Senator William Proxmire and Senator Gore, to be marked for destruction in a cause that we believed to be in the public interest, but we did not want to drag down others to political disaster and reenact the role of Lord Raglan who sent the noble six hundred to death at Balaklava in the Crimean War.

The courageous Senator Douglas then went on to say:

Some of us have been effectively disposed of; more probably will be; but the issue remains. And as for one who still believes (perhaps foolishly) that in a Democracy no issue is settled until it is settled right and that in the long run an educated public opinion will prevail, I remain guardedly hopeful.

Gentleman, it is totally unfair to force additional taxes on the average American when, in 1966, the 20 major oil companies in America had a net clear profit of over \$4¼ billion yet paid taxes to their country of only 8½ percent. How many of our hard-working constituents—both low and high paid—would not like to be in the 8½ percent income tax bracket?

The Atlantic Oil Co., which in 1966 had a net profit of over \$113 million, paid no Federal income tax at all. In fact, going as far back as 1962 with an accumulated net profit of more than \$340 million, the Atlantic Co., has paid no Federal income tax at all. The giant Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, which in 1966 showed a net profit of over \$1 billion is in a 6.3 percent tax bracket. And the Marathon Co., which in 1962

showed a net profit of over \$37 million, not only did not pay taxes that year but actually received a \$2.2 million tax credit.

We hear that big business was in favor of a tax increase. And I ask: Why not?—they are not going to be paying it.

If you are paying no tax at all, then a 10-percent income tax surcharge merely adds 10 percent to your "zero" tax.

But that is not the case of the average American taxpayer who must closely watch his budget, make his monthly payments, and worry where he can cut corners in the household budget to pay for the increase in taxes.

There are many other blatant examples of tax loopholes and in order to correct this problem, on August 31, 1967, I introduced an 11-point program to end the tax loopholes in the United States today. But Congress has failed to act on this legislation.

To point out the inequities in our present tax structure—at a time when the Congress has voted a 10-percent income tax surcharge on the average American person—I will point to the following:

In 1965 there were 35 Americans so-called "taxpayers" with incomes exceeding \$500,000 annually who paid no income tax at all, including five with incomes of \$5 million or more.

Most certainly, Mr. Speaker, these people are not concerned about a 10-percent income tax surcharge. Why should they? It is the average American breadwinner—not these people—who are going to be forced to shoulder the burden.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the Congress has acted unwisely and unfairly by forcing workers to pay more when others pay nothing at all or are free to shirk their full responsibilities. A 10-percent Federal income tax surcharge is unjustified as long as loopholes let the ultrarich and the privileged few bleed billions of dollars a year out of our National Treasury.

SOUTH AFRICA FREEDOM DAY: JUNE 26

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the people of Africa and the world have been called upon once more this year to commemorate June 26, the National Day of the oppressed and struggling people of South Africa. This is a day observed by the liberation forces under the leadership of one of the major South African liberation movements, the African National Congress which has gained wide support among African and international organizations. It is a day of rededication to the struggle to eliminate the curse of racialism, tyranny, and minority rule in South Africa.

June 26 remains a symbol of the determination of the African people to banish the oppression and discrimination which surrounds their lives; it is a day with its roots in the historical strug-

gle of the African people born amidst the peoples' resistance to inequality and apartheid.

On June 26, 1950, hundreds of thousands of African people, led by the African National Congress—ANC—embarked on mass action. The South African Government took refuge behind increased force and repressive legislation which smothered vital opposition. In 1960, the Government banned the major African political parties cutting off legal and peaceful avenues of change within the racist society, and the movements went both into exile and underground. To understand the value and significance of June 26 and appreciate its meaning to millions of Africans in South Africa, it is necessary to recall that the history of minority white rule in South Africa is a history of rule by force and violence.

The Europeans arrived at the Cape of Good Hope in 1652 and were able to entrench themselves and expand their power by the use of force. The land and political rights of the Africans were taken away, and never restored and a series of military confrontations occurred as the Africans fought to defend what was rightfully theirs.

Through the years, opposition continued and so did the magnitude of violent reprisals. There was shooting and killing of Africans during the 1919 Anti-Pass campaign, during the strike by 80,000 Rand African miners, and the Port Elizabeth African workers' strike in 1920. In 1921, the notorious Bulhoek massacre took place when 163 Africans were killed and 130 wounded. The Bondelswarts massacre of 1922 saw 100 people shot and hundreds wounded. People were killed during the Durban beer boycott in 1929 and during an Anti-Pass campaign in 1930. There were killings at Worcester in 1930, Vereeniging in 1938 and during the Rand African miners' strike in 1946.

When the Nationalist Party took the reins of government in 1948, an era of intensified legal and physical repression began. Their doctrine of apartheid meant not only a more sophisticated system of segregation, but also the increased concentration of political power in the hands of a minority. There was the introduction of innumerable apartheid and "security" laws, such as the unlawful organization bill, later renamed the Suppression of Communism Act, which virtually enabled the Government to brand any opposition as Communist. The passage of this act in 1950 was followed by the shooting down of 18 Africans during May Day demonstrations in Johannesburg.

In the same year, the ANC called on the African and all other oppressed people and democrats of South Africa to join in unity on June 26 in a national stoppage of work to honor the victims of decades of violence and to assert their resolve to pursue the struggle for freedom. This act of work stoppage was for the African mass defiance of the law. The people responded to the call to join in mass demonstrations and strikes, and thus the date came to be accepted as a national day symbolizing the nature and objectives of the struggle for freedom

and providing the occasion for rededication to that cause.

There are many milestones along the path symbolized by June 26. In 1952, the African National Congress in close cooperation with the South African Indian Congress galvanized the masses into a National Campaign for the Defiance of Unjust Laws aimed at the repeal of six of the laws under which white supremacy is maintained. From June 26 until December more than 8,500 people defied apartheid and were jailed. The Government responded with more legislation designed to contain the emergence of majority rule. Three years later, on June 26, 1955, a Congress of the People was convened in the face of fierce intimidation by the Government and its police forces. From every corner of South Africa delegates and representatives of all races in South Africa assembled at Kliptown, Johannesburg, and despite harassment and constant provocation the Congress drew up a Freedom Charter, which was the blueprint of the political, economic, and social structures which the people demand. This Freedom Charter became the false basis of charges of high treason against 156 leaders of the liberation movement who were arrested and some of whom stood trial for nearly 5 years.

Since that historic day, the violence has only continued. Peasants resisting apartheid measures were shot in 1957 and 1958, and who can forget the publicized tragedy at Sharpeville in 1960 when 69 Africans were killed during a peaceful demonstration outside of a police station. The Government resorted to the rule of force and proclaimed a state of emergency in parts of the country, and under Proclamation 400, this condition is still enforced in the so-called self-governing Bantustan of the Transkei.

On June 26, 1963, Walter Sisulu, an ANC leader now incarcerated on Robben Island, said to the nation over an underground radio:

We warn the Government that drastic laws will not stop our struggle for liberation. Throughout the ages men have sacrificed—they have given their lives for their ideals. And we are also determined to surrender our lives for our freedom. In the face of violence, men struggling for freedom have had to meet violence with violence. How can it be otherwise in South Africa? Changes must come. Changes for better, but not without sacrifice . . . We will succeed!

It can be seen that in the struggles launched on June 26 there is a determination to win freedom, a dedication to a national cause and to the principles of unity among the ranks of the majority. June 26 has grown into an international day of solidarity with the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa. It has been adopted and is observed by the peoples of Africa, Asia, and South America, by opponents of racism and minority rule, and by democrats comprising millions of people in many parts of the world. International and other organizations—political, cultural, social—and students' movements have demonstrated their support for the cause of freedom in South Africa by calling on their supporters to observe June 26.

Today I call on you to do so in solidarity with the majority in South Africa;

to reflect on the cruel oppression facing the peoples in South Africa and to think on the growing identification of our own Nation with the oppressors.

THE SEARCH MUST BEGIN

HON. JAMES A. MCCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, efforts to curb the availability of firearms have gone from the absurd into the realm of the unbelievable.

The National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice made its recommendations on the Army marksmanship program last March, and now Secretary Resor has announced the changes to be made. It boils down to a sharp curtailment of Army support for such programs as the junior and senior rifle clubs and the national rifle matches.

Surely the Army, above all others, must know that one of the strengths of our country's military capabilities lies in its ability to mobilize the civilian soldier during times of emergency and that the reason for its success in the past has in no small measure been attributable to the experience with firearms these civilians had in their private lives. Is this military advantage to be sacrificed to the hysteria created by the Kennedy assassination? Hopefully, the answer is "No."

In its efforts to disarm the public at large, the Johnson administration is now taking steps that will surely affect the security of this Nation. They are disarming us in a very real sense.

I cannot find the words to express my indignation at this endless stream of gun-control proposals. Surely we have come to the end of this insanity. The only step left for Mr. Johnson to take is confiscation of every gun in private hands.

Antigun advocates justify their proposals on the grounds of crime prevention, when actually they are contributing to the continual downgrading of symbols of authority that caused the crime to soar in the first place.

In this connection, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial written by Pete Hackworth for the June 5 edition of the Idaho Free Press and Caldwell News-Tribune.

Mr. Hackworth writes:

It is our firm belief that the relaxing of authority and general permissiveness over the past number of years has encouraged criminal-minded persons and deranged individuals to initiate their illegal acts.

Because of its relevance to the whole question of gun controls, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

THE SEARCH MUST BEGIN

The shooting of Robert Kennedy is a shocking thing. But it cannot be termed unexpected.

And that in itself is shocking. Perhaps more shocking, when one stops to think of it, than the actual shooting.

We could repeat in these columns all of the stock phrases following such a senseless

and dastardly deed, but those phrases already fill the other columns on this page. So we shall make comment we hope will alter the thinking of even a few of our readers.

Our urging is that, first, every person examine himself to discover that it is possible for him to understand the plight of people less well off than himself; search his conscience to learn whether he really thinks he is superior to other persons of another race or circumstance.

We believe that such an exercise in humility and understanding is necessary before any "cure" for the violence and turmoil in this country is effected.

Our further urging is that the mayors of the nation's cities, the governors of our states, the federal law enforcement people announce as one that in the future the breaking of the law will be met with resistance; that lawbreakers will be arrested and brought to a speedy trial.

Our people simply must be given to understand that to break the law is to break the law, and that they must and shall be punished.

It is our firm belief that the relaxing of authority and general permissiveness over the past number of years has encouraged criminal-minded persons and deranged individuals to initiate their illegal acts.

It is our further belief that a tightening up, a new and stiff policy toward the breaking of the law—by anyone—will help to dispel the notion that our laws are written for someone else.

Departing from the tragedy of the Kennedy shooting, let us present an example of our premise, something so ridiculous as to be almost beyond belief. But it serves our purpose well because it illustrates lawlessness which has become "accepted" as something other than lawlessness.

In Washington, D.C., delegates to a convention of the AFL-CIO Textile Workers Union of America discovered that the tablecloths on the tables they were eating from were made by a textile chain they had been fighting for years.

Instead of requesting the management of the Washington Hilton Hotel to remove the tablecloths, if that is what they desired they jerked them off the tables, breaking glassware and dishes in the process—destroying property, breaking the law.

And they got away with it. There wasn't one arrest to our knowledge.

Related to the Kennedy shooting?

You bet it is.

And it's got to stop!

RIOT INSURANCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, J. H. Blades, of Houston, Tex., delivered a remarkable address before the Special Conference on Government and Insurance, sponsored by the American Management Association, at New York City on May 14, 1968. Mr. Blades pointed out very clearly the interrelationship of two false premises—false premises which have wide currency in our country today. First, Mr. Blades lays to rest for all of us any notion that some new Federal measures will make it possible to insure financial losses from riots at reasonable rates. Insuring against the results without dealing with the problem makes no real sense.

Second, Mr. Blades points out how the desire not to commit some cruel or difficult actions in order to quell civil disturbances has guided us falsely. No matter how unpleasant, firmness is, in the long run, the only sure way to save both lives and property. Never have I seen this latter point made so movingly and so well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Blades' fine speech to my colleagues, as follows:

I have had the privilege of appearing before the American Management Association on several occasions but never have I had a desire to put over a feeling as I do today.

As many of you probably know, when you fly the ocean you have a tendency to get your days and nights mixed up. I couldn't sleep too well last night and I began to think about this conference and its theme, "Government and Insurance," and our particular topic this afternoon on non-admitted and surplus lines insurance, also the fact that I have been asked to report to you on the London insurance market. The warp and woof of the wool is intricately interwoven and it's an interesting pattern, for you cannot separate the London insurance market from our insurance industry and it now appears that we cannot separate problems of government and insurance.

As I thought about my assignment last night in bed, my mind began to wander and I soon realized that this was the twentieth time that I had returned across the Atlantic to this country. The first trips were when I had the privilege of serving in the United States Marine Corps, attached to the Navy on a Navy troop ship, during World War II, and I couldn't help but compare last night's return with another entry to this great city that I will never forget. I had the privilege of being on the first troop ship to enter the New York Harbor after World War II in Europe was over. We received a radio message a few days out from port instructing us to dress ship and there were only a few old Chiefs that even knew what it meant. We strung signal flags from bow to stern. Sailors and soldiers lined our decks and we took the salute of a grateful people. I will never forget the small, little boats that came out to meet us, with their bands and signs. I will never forget when we sailed past the Statue of Liberty, a gift from the people of France, a symbol of freedom and America itself. There was not a dry eye on the ship that day and as we steamed on in every ship, big or little, blew its horn. Confetti flew from the windows and there was a band on the pier as we entered our slip. It was great being an American that day!

The reception last night was a bit different. My wife and I crawled into a cab at Kennedy Airport and we headed for the city. You know, you can learn a lot from a New York taxi driver. Their English may be poor but their logic and predictions are sometimes astounding. I told the cabbie we had been out of the country for about three weeks and I asked him about the Presidential election. His fast retort was that "We've got six no-goods. Who could trust young Bobby Kennedy? Nixon, he's a loser. Now, Rockefeller—his father certainly taught those boys how to count their money and if he gets in they would tax us to death—and Reagan, who wants a movie star in the White House? And Humphrey he has had his nose in the public trough too long. McCarthy—who is he?" His observations were interesting. I then asked him about riots and race relations. We touched on the problems at Columbia and the aftermath of the Martin Luther King murder. He shrugged his shoulders, a bit in disgust and shame, "What are we going to do? We seem to be letting hate and minority groups run all over us." You could see his bewilder-

ment on his face. Gentlemen, we are taking too much for granted today. Those of you who have the privilege of traveling and returning know without a shadow of a doubt that we have today the greatest country in the world. I think too many of us must think the last words of the National Anthem are "Play Ball."

A lot of people have asked me just what is the London insurance market. This marketplace could be in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Houston, Geneva or elsewhere, but it's not and London is the center for insurance. In that center we find Lloyd's as the hub and around Lloyd's is the companies' market, not only composed of British companies but American and European companies as well and some of you may be surprised to know that on many of our large oil placements in this country fine Japanese insurance companies participate through the London market with the rest of the companies. It is truly the center.

The condition of the London insurance market is serious. London Underwriters are now unable to complete insurance coverages that they could do a few years ago and companies all over the world are being sought to help complete the orders.

London has taken a terrible beating! They have survived many hurricanes but nothing like "Betsy." They have been hit with the Alaskan earthquake, the large City Service loss, the Shell loss in Rotterdam, the loss of large offshore drilling units in the North Sea and elsewhere, the McCormick fire, the large department store in Brussels, the "Torrey Canyon" and other large hulls, and a number of unfortunate aviation losses. True, London Underwriters do not stand these losses alone but they have been involved in all of them and a large percentage of the losses have trickled back to the London market. Never in history have so many big losses taken place in such a short period of time.

A few years ago a \$20,000,000 loss seemed impossible. Now we know this is not true and they are happening with some regularity.

PML's (possible maximum losses) must be reviewed. Underwriters now realize that when they take a 10% line on a \$50,000,000 exposure they may have a \$5,000,000 loss. Many rates have been too low. I know that it may not be wise for me to stand before a group of insurance managers and buyers and say this but in some cases conditions have been too broad and insurance has been used for maintenance.

The big question is, "Where are we?"

Last week while I was in London many names (members of Lloyd's Syndicates) got their notices on the results for the 1965 year. With rare exceptions, because of hurricane "Betsy," all of them are having to put up more money. This means that most names suffered a loss in 1964. They are now paying their losses for 1965 and the estimate for the 1966 year, which will be on the area, giving credits off the coast of California, Texas and Louisiana but with a substantial surcharge in the North Sea. They are also prepared now to write coverage with a dual valuation clause, insuring the unit for the appraised value but paying a lesser agreed amount on a total loss. This, of course, will help alleviate the capacity problem and still satisfy drilling contractors' requirements. London Underwriters weathered the storm.

The Chairman of Lloyd's is in New York today. I think in many ways this is a symbol of the great interest which this market has in America and our insurance industry.

Lloyd's has now opened the doors so that Americans can become names at Lloyd's. This was done in the hope that it would bolster London's capacity. It is my understanding that 28 people have made application, far less than was hoped for. Many Americans are dubious about taking on the unlimited liability associated with a name at Lloyd's.

To discuss the highlights of the London

insurance market the last few weeks, no one could be fair with you without trying to give you the complete picture of the concern on the riot exposure in our country. To understand this concern you first must try to grasp the feeling and the mood of these Underwriters and in a way I think the feeling and the mood of the people all over the world that are now so desperately looking to this country for leadership.

From my travels and my conversations with people in all walks of life and in various countries, I don't think over two or three percent of the people outside of this country really believe the Warren report. They are mystified by our Presidential primary elections. They are following our Presidential election probably almost as closely as we are and they are extremely curious.

By the use of Telstar and the TV systems, the riots and looting that have run rampant in our country in the last few weeks have been flashed all over the world. I could see that the English people particularly were concerned and amazed as they reported to me pictures of policemen standing by while looters walked off with stolen goods and their amazement at seeing National Guard troops with a commentator's note that they were without ammunition and instructed not to take action.

As various Underwriters explained to me, their names who have lost money over the last few years are calling, some for the first time, and they are asking, "What are you going to do about riot insurance in America?" My underwriting friends are quick to point out that they write riot insurance in various countries all over the world, some that have a history of riots far worse than we have ever had in America or that we could really expect in America; however, they write riot insurance at a rate! It is now obvious to all of us that American insurance companies and London Underwriters can no longer provide riot insurance in cores of many of our major cities at the same price that it has been provided in the past. The American companies seem to have no voice. Time is running out. If something is not done and done soon, I think you may find many London Underwriters pulling out of America, and I know in their hearts they would like to stand by our country as they have by the oil industry. If they pull out, it will be both on direct and reinsurance business as respects physical damage insurance with any type of riot exposure whatsoever. Gentlemen, you cannot insure a social problem when a government makes only a negligible effort to control it. Let me speak bluntly and fairly with you, for you, as American buyers of insurance, have a lot at stake in seeing that a fair and free American insurance market continues to exist with access to the reinsurance markets of the world.

Without the support of the London market, direct and as reinsurance, our capacity in this country to insure physical damage risks will be severely hampered and the government will move into the vacuum.

I would now like to make a point of personal privilege. I mentioned to you earlier that I had the privilege in World War II of serving on a troop ship. In this capacity I was trained for riot duty; I was trained in the handling of people and situations. I can recall one time when brigs in California were emptied into our ship and we kept the men locked in the holds until we were twenty miles at sea and these men were taken over to New Guinea to prepare for amphibious landings. I can recall that we kept Thompson submachine guns on each wing of the bridge to protect our Captain from attempted mutiny by some of our 4,000 passengers. I can recall sending the troops below deck preparing them for possible air attacks and on one occasion when a U.S. Army Major tried to come up the companionway with his troops

back of him. I can recall standing there with my bayonet an inch or two from his throat and how he finally turned and went back in the hold. I can recall when threats were made to break prisoners out of our brig. Yes, and I can recall one occasion when our Chaplain came to me in the Sergeant of the Guard's office complaining that they had threatened to kill him if he did not get some men out of the brig. I can recall when some unhappy passengers tried to take our mess hall and we had to back them down. I can recall bringing German prisoners back from Europe, the SS troops and their hardened criminals. I can recall in the invasion of southern France when it became our despicable duty to have to force men to the landing nets who had marched through North Africa who should not have been forced back into another campaign. Some left their rifles, their ammunition, their bedrolls, some went to pieces, and we were ashamed that night as we sat in our marine compartment, for we would have preferred to have gone instead of them or at least with them. I recall when our First Sergeant, John Michael Murphy, taught us how

to give an order, never argue, and to turn our back and walk off knowing that it would be obeyed.

I remember the torture that men went through mentally, returning from war, trying to prepare their minds to meet their mothers, wives and girl friends. I can recall one incident when a man went berserk and terrorized everyone on a darkened ship under the pressure of the return and he finally jumped overboard. I can recall bringing various North African troops back from the Italian campaign to Africa with their sacks of gold teeth, rings, ears and watches off the Germans they had killed. We had to keep various tribes separated, for they hated each other as much as the common enemy. Yes, gentlemen, I have worked on Goat Island in San Francisco Bay at a general court martial brig; I've seen a turnkey and a guard and I have learned a little about the psychology of a crowd and riot duty. I tell you these stories today not as a war hero—I was in the rear echelon—but, gentlemen, because as I thought about these experiences last night as I prepared my thoughts for this talk, I

could not help but think of the fact that during all of these experiences not once was a shot fired, not once was a bayonet used, but, gentlemen, we were never without live ammunition. There was never any doubt in our minds that we would use the force at our disposal to do the job and I don't think there was ever any doubt on the part of the men we worked with that we would take whatever steps were necessary to enforce law and order.

Gentlemen, we must call insurrection, insurrection. Government subsidy to insurance companies is no answer, whether it be tax relief, a direct dole or as Federal reinsurance. We must return to law and order! You, as American corporate buyers of insurance, must alert the people to another freedom and industry that we are about to lose by default.

Some people in the world love us; some hate us, but all look to us for leadership. The London insurance market, as well as all the world, is pondering and waiting to see if America has the guts to right our ship and return to law and order.